

ANGLO CATHOLICISM IN THE
DIOCESE OF CHRISTCHURCH
1850-1920

A thesis

submitted in partial fulfilment
of the requirements for the Degree

of

Master of Arts in History

in the

University of Canterbury

by

H. M. Bowron

University of Canterbury
1975

IN REMEMBRANCE OF
MICHAEL FRANCIS ARDLEY

TABLE OF ABBREVIATIONS

ADA	Auckland Diocesan Archives
ANZ Gazette	Australia and New Zealand Gazette
AP	Avonside Papers
ATL	Alexander Turnbull Library
CA Times	Canterbury Association Times
CC	Church Chronicle
CDA	Christchurch Diocesan Archives
CG	Church Gazette
CM	Church Magazine
CN	New Zealand Church News
CPL	Canterbury Public Library
CSN	Community of the Sacred Name
CUL	Canterbury University Library
DCSB	Deaconess Community of the Sisters of Bethany
DNB	Dictionary of National Biography
NAW	National Archives, Wellington
KPO	Kaiapoi Parish Office
LT	Lyttelton Times
PS	Private Source
SMPO	St. Michael's Parish Office
WDA	Wellington Diocesan Archives

NOTE ON USE OF TERMS

HIGH CHURCHMANSHIP - Refers to the eighteenth century anglican tradition which stood for a strict defence of the establishment against the attacks of dissent and puritanism, an insistence on sound doctrine, traditionalism, and the punctilious observance of the services and forms of the prayer book.

TRACTARIANISM - Refers to the first phase of anglo catholicism, which emphasised the spiritual autonomy of the church against the prevailing erastianism and liberalism of the 1830's.

RITUALISM - Refers to the second phase of anglo catholicism, which was concerned with the revival of catholic ceremonial and liturgy.

LIBERAL CATHOLICISM - Refers to the theological movement which sought to remedy the theological archaism of tractarianism. The two decisive emphases of this school were their liberal and flexible approach to the interpretation of the bible (particularly the old testament) and their advocacy of christian socialism as a means of vigorously attacking the political and social problems of the day.

ANGLO CATHOLICISM - Refers to the movement to reassert a sense of corporate holiness in the Church of England. Its three successive phases were tractarianism, ritualism and liberal catholicism.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
ABSTRACT	
1. THE ENGLISH BACKGROUND.....	1
11. THE CANTERBURY ASSOCIATION	22
111. EARLY CANTERBURY ANGLICANISM	57
1V. THE CARLYON CASE	93
V. PHILLIPSTOWN	134
V1. ST. MICHAEL'S	150
V11. THE PERRY-GOSSET CASE	188
V111. CONCLUSION	229
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	241
BIBLIOGRAPHY	242
APPENDIX A	248

ABSTRACT OF THESIS

The purpose of this thesis is to trace the origins and growth of anglo catholicism in the diocese of Christchurch from 1850 - 1920. New Zealand church history is a comparatively virgin field, especially in the analysis of movements and ideas. Anglo catholicism has received scant attention from the standard authorities on New Zealand anglican history, such as Parr, Purchas and Morrell. It seemed important that this neglect be remedied before eyewitness accounts of some part of the seminal period were lost forever. This thesis is also an attempt by the author to examine critically his own religious tradition.

A major source of information has been the Christchurch diocesan newspaper. The city's major newspapers have also been of some assistance. The diocesan archives and the parish papers of St. Bartholomew's, Kaiapoi and St. Michael's, Christchurch have yielded a considerable amount of source material. The private correspondence of Canterbury Association members was consulted in the Alexander Turnbull and Canterbury Museum libraries. The Canterbury University library provided many early Canterbury books and papers. Conversations, interviews and letters provided a limited but valuable amount of information. A few secondary sources, principally theses, have afforded leads to further information and suggestions for general conclusions.

The thesis begins with a brief survey of the movement in England, followed by a closer study of the influence of tractarianism on the Canterbury Association and early Canterbury anglicanism. There follows an

account of the abortive beginnings of ritualism at Kaiapoi, in the Carlyon case. From here the gradual emergence of anglo catholicism is traced through the establishment of the movement at Phillipstown and the formation of the Community of the Sacred Name. The "capture" of St. Michael's in 1910 and the sources of opposition to this development is then analysed. The Perry-Gosset case, which involved an unsuccessful attempt to end episcopal protection of anglo catholicism at St. Michael's, marks the end of the seminal period.

The thesis concludes that anglo catholicism made little progress in the first 30 years of the Canterbury settlement because the Christchurch diocese had so many inherited advantages that it did not need a strong church movement to assert its denominational identity. The Christchurch diocese was predominantly low church, but included a small anglo catholic party. The anglo catholics found it difficult to make any headway against the inertia which preserved the status quo of a pre-Oxford movement church. Anglo catholicism managed to establish itself in the early part of the twentieth century because of a weakening in the predominant New Zealand religious tradition of colonial evangelicalism. By 1920 the period of origins was over and anglo catholicism had been partially accepted into the mainstream of Christchurch anglican life.

CHAPTER 1

THE ENGLISH BACKGROUND

The two great achievements of the Victorian anglican church were its recovery of catholicity and its great missionary expansion overseas. It was anglo catholicism which was almost entirely responsible for the recovery of catholicity by the Church of England. By the beginning of the twentieth century a majority of anglicans could repeat the words:

I believe in One, Holy, Catholic
and Apostolic Church

with assurance and meaning. There had been a revival of a sense of corporate holiness in which churchmen regarded one another as members of the body of christ and valued sacraments highly as the means of entrance into and means of perseverance within this holy society. Anglo Catholicism was also partially responsible for the great missionary expansion.

In this introductory chapter I shall define the terms, high churchmanship, tractarianism, ritualism, liberal catholicism. My object in doing this will be to show that each of these anglican attitudes was at one time or other a component of anglo catholicism, and that the term anglo catholicism changed its meaning in successive decades. In this survey I shall be neither exhaustive nor original. ¹

1 The books I have drawn from are

Owen Chadwick,	<u>The Mind of the Oxford Movement;</u>
Owen Chadwick,	<u>The Victorian Church, Parts 1 and 11;</u>
Alec Vidler,	<u>The Church in an Age of Revolution;</u>
Roger Lloyd,	<u>The Church of England 1900-1965;</u>
A.M. Allchin,	<u>The Silent Rebellion;</u>
Michael Hill,	<u>The Religious Order;</u>
J. C. Livingstone,	<u>Modern Christian Thought.</u>

High churchmen and tractarians belonged to two different parties within the anglican church. The tractarians stood in the high church tradition but were not synonymous with it. The high church party was a distinct entity in its own right, which contributed to but was not synonymous with tractarianism and its later development into ritualism.

The high church tradition became self-conscious about the year 1688, although it had been a strand of anglican thought since the reformation. It stood for a strict defence of the establishment against the attacks of dissent and puritanism, an insistence on sound doctrine, traditionalism, and the punctilious observance of the services and forms of the prayer book. The high churchmen were tories in their politics and stressed the authority of the king and the bishops. They disliked continental protestantism and feared its influence on puritan and evangelical anglicans. As advocates of patristic scholarship they claimed that early church history furnished justification for a number of pre-reformation practices. Furthermore the high churchmen appealed to the patristic fathers as interpreters of scripture as opposed to the emphasis of continental protestantism on scripture alone and justification by faith. The high churchmen manifested a sacramentalism of the world and nature with a particular emphasis on baptism and the eucharist at a time when lutheran theology seemed to be becoming more rational and less sacramental. By the end of the eighteenth century the high church party came to be associated with an austere and earnest piety which distrusted the enthusiasm and spontaneity of the wesleyan and evangelical revivals. From this devotional attitude came the nickname High and dry which was applied to the high churchmen. With this emphasis on sacramentalism and strict piety there was a demand for a more decent and reverent type of worship than that obtaining in the puritan and

latitudinarian segments of the church. But many high church attitudes were as much the product of historical crises as of doctrinal convictions. The high value placed upon bishops was partially the result of puritan attacks on the episcopal ministry in the Elizabethan era. The doctrine of the divine right of kings was derived not only from scripture but also from the traumatic shock of the execution of King Charles the martyr. From this souring experience came also the high churchman's distrust of calvinism, which was associated in his mind with the disloyal protestantism responsible for the foul sin of regicide. The last distinguishing feature of the high church party was its opposition to the latitudinarianism and liberalism of the day. In an age in which philosophers sought to prove the reasonableness of God and latitudinarians sought to widen the comprehensiveness and toleration of the Church of England, the high church party was determined to ensure that the 39 articles remained the doctrinal hedge of anglicanism.

What, then, was the essential difference between the high churchman and the tractarian? In a word, it was enthusiasm. Whereas the high churchman became stiff with embarrassment at evangelical fervour, the tractarian had learnt not to be afraid of his feelings. An inheritance of evangelical pietism coupled with romanticism in the arts and literature made the tractarian desire a religion of transcendent mysticism. This point is admirably summarised by Chadwick:

Probably it is this element of feeling, the desire to use poetry as a vehicle of religious language, the sense of awe and mystery in religion, the profundity of reverence, the concern with the conscience not only by way of duty, but by growth towards holiness, which marks the vague distinction between the old-fashioned high churchmen and the Oxford men.²

He goes on to emphasize the contrast between the old and the new by saying of the high churchmen:

they were far too concerned with defending the Church, maintaining the privileges of the establishment; they were sober, sensible men, suspicious of extremism or (in its eighteenth century sense) enthusiasm. And by contrast, Newman thought of the Oxford men as men of personal influence and enthusiasm, suspicious of sobriety and common sense, anxious to strive after depth even at the expense of clarity, content to be less coherent so long as they were not shallow, using propositions rather as means than as ends, more concerned with truth than with the defence of the Establishment, more content even to let the Establishment go so long as truth prevailed.³

This difference in emphasis led the tractarians to develop several new doctrinal emphases. The political upheavals of the late 1820's and early 1830's threatened the old high church ideal of the union of church and state. The political emancipation of dissenters and catholics, coupled with the attacks of extreme whig politicians during the stormy passage of the reform bill, seemed to lay the way open for state manipulation of the established church. In 1833 the whig administration pushed through a bill to reform the Irish Church. The alarm was sounded at Oxford, and the tractarians came into being as a party. In opposition to whig manipulation of the church, and the attacks of liberal philosophy and theology on supernatural religion, the tractarians asserted the need for spiritual autonomy of the church. They believed that only a rigid adherence to the doctrine of the apostolic succession could save the church, for only in the bishops could be found the authority and

leadership to reassert its spiritual autonomy. Some tractarians thought it might become necessary to dissolve the connection between church and state.

The tractarians pressed for a deepening and renewal of the sacramental life of the anglican church. They wished to see the seven sacraments frequently used in order to develop a sense of corporate holiness amongst the people of God. For this reason the tractarians were outspoken in their criticism of the deficiencies of much anglican parochial life.

Like the high churchmen, the tractarians turned to the early church fathers as interpreters of scripture but went further in making the tradition of the early church the model on which the Church of England should reform itself. By contrast high churchmen had turned to tradition only to defend and conserve the establishment. This radical attack on the protestant position of scripture alone and a hatred of the reformation in some quarters of the tractarian movement seemed to many Englishmen to be a disloyal attack on their protestant religion.

In contrast to the liberals the tractarians held that conscience and not reason was the safeguard of faith. Faith was obedient submission to the will of God rather than a rational assent to a set of intellectual propositions. This moralism lay at the heart of tractarian piety.

But the tractarians were above all the promoters of a movement of religious devotion and discipline. They were not primarily a movement of religious thought and, in fact, the general body of the anglican church, by and large, rejected or ignored their doctrinal emphases. They ransacked the devotional treasures of centuries in order to revive a catholic piety which was to transform the spirituality of the anglican communion. Paradoxically the Oxford movement was a doctrinal failure while possessing great devotional power. This devotional power was most clearly expressed in the moral and pastoral aspect of the movement. John Keble, the

humble country vicar, was the exemplar of a movement which concerned itself with the pastoral situation rather than the creation of a body of systematic theological thought. Its appeal to the parson in his parish ensured the survival of tractarianism beyond its final trouncing at Oxford in 1845 and its rejection by theologians.

But in the decade before 1845 tractarianism was born at Oxford with far reaching consequences for the Canterbury settlement. In 1836 Newman and his fellow tract writers became the dominant influence at Oxford as a result of the Hampden affair. In that year the regius chair at divinity at Oxford fell vacant and the whig prime minister, Lord Melbourne, decided to appoint Dr Hampden, a don renowned for his liberal views on dissenters and contemporary philosophy and theology. A formidable coalition of tractarian, evangelical, and tory academics agitated furiously and secured a vote of censure against the appointment of Dr Hampden. The tractarians reaped a rich reward for their efforts. The censure was a direct attack on the royal supremacy, a vote of no confidence in the whig prime minister's ability to choose suitable leaders for the Church of England, and many Oxford waverers rallied to Newman's party. From 1836 to 1840 Newman and his followers lorded it over Oxford. They were lionised by the undergraduates, and exerted a considerable influence within the church.

In 1839 an equally significant event took place at Cambridge, where a group of young undergraduates formed the camden society. The revival of church architecture was their objective and they sought to build and renovate churches in which:

the Rubricks and Canons of the Church
of England may be consistently observed
and the Sacraments rubrickly and
decently administered.

Whereas the Oxford tractarians were concerned with doctrinal truth and uninterested in liturgical innovation, the Cambridge ecclesiologists sought to lead men to truth through worship. The romanticism of the early nineteenth century had shattered the classical conventions of taste and left a chaos of conflicting styles and values in which the Camden society set itself up as the sole authority in ecclesiological matters. It proclaimed gothic to be the only acceptable style of church architecture and clergymen of all shades of opinion flocked to it for advice.

After four years its patrons or members included two archbishops, sixteen bishops, twenty one archdeacons and rural deans, sixteen architects, and more than 700 ordinary members.⁴

Later ritual cases were to cause many members to resign as the Camden society became more involved in controversy, but its effect was enduring. Almost all the anglican churches built in the nineteenth century were in the gothic style and reflected the Cambridge ecclesiologists' desire for symbolism, sacramentalism and reverence. Moreover the society pioneered the adoption of catholic ceremonial and liturgical practices which blossomed into ritualism.

Meanwhile, at Oxford the tractarians had reached the zenith of their triumphant first phase by 1840. The years 1841 to 1845 were marked by defeat after defeat. In 1841 the Prussian and British governments decided to create an Anglo-Prussian protestant bishopric of Jerusalem. The tractarians were more sympathetic to the catholic and orthodox churches and would not countenance the idea of entering into communion with protestant heretics.

4 Chad, V. Ch, Part 1, p.213.

The following were members of both the Canterbury association and the Camden society

Bishop Wilberforce	Lord John Manners	Sir W Heathcote
Bishop Phillpots	The Rev W. F. Hook	W. S. Vaux
Archdeacon R. Wilberforce		Earl Nelson
The Rev R. C. Trench	Lord Courtenay	

They protested vociferously and unsuccessfully. Newman's faith in the legitimacy of the anglican church was badly shaken. Moreover he faced considerable problems as a party leader. Some of the younger tractarians were out and out romanisers, continually on the verge of seceding and urging Newman to extreme actions.

Partly to keep them in the anglican obedience and partly to quiet his own nagging doubts about the validity of the anglican position, Newman wrote tract 90 in 1841. Tract 90 attempted to demonstrate that the 39 articles were a catholic statement of faith designed to root out pre-reformation corruptions and to prevent protestant excesses. This liberty in interpreting the 39 articles struck many Englishmen as being dishonest casuistry. Newman was fiercely criticised by the bishops and many leading churchmen. Discouraged and depressed he retired to Littlemore, his private monastery, gave up the leadership of the tractarians, and brooded over his intellectual suspicions that Rome was the true church. Pusey and Keble took over the leadership of the tractarians and proceeded to lead them to a succession of disastrous defeats. Newman's faults as a party leader were dwarfed by the ineptness of Pusey and Keble. Quiet and retiring men, they were unable to restrain their extremists and prevent the party being drawn into hopeless struggles for indefensible positions. One of the extremists, W. G. Ward, published a book entitled The Ideal of the Christian Church, which was fiercely critical of the anglican church and expressed unreserved admiration for the roman catholic church. In 1845 the outraged university of Oxford retaliated by censuring Ward and stripping him of his degrees. In the same year Newman defected to Rome and the tractarians were thrown into complete disarray. Eclipsed at Oxford by the liberals, tractarian hopes and activities shifted to the vicarages of their members and sympathisers throughout England.

In 1847 the alarm was sounded again. The whig prime minister, Lord John Russell, decided to bestow the vacant see of Manchester on the infamous Dr Hampden. Anglican clergy of all shades of opinion began a campaign of public protest, led by the tractarians. Responding to the wishes of many anglican clergy, Bishop Wilberforce of Oxford instituted an inquiry into the doctrinal orthodoxy of Hampden. He threatened to go to law if Hampden did not withdraw certain expressions of liberal opinion made in the past. After a vague withdrawal by Hampden, Wilberforce dropped the suit and earned himself a reputation for vacillating duplicity. But feeling was running so high that at a tumultuous scene in Bow Church several eminent ecclesiastical lawyers unsuccessfully attempted to prevent the confirmation of the legally elected Bishop Hampden. Frustrated here, they applied to the Court of Queen's Bench for a mandamus to compel the Archbishop of Canterbury to hear the objections against Dr Hampden, and secured a trial. By a narrow majority the judges found in favour of Dr Hampden, so that the Church of England was bitterly divided. Many of the laity resented clerical attacks on Hampden while many of the clergy had come to regard Lord John Russell as a tyrant and to find the royal supremacy intolerable. In this atmosphere of mistrust and recrimination some anglicans began to think of conversion to Rome as an increasingly attractive option. It was in this troubled latter half of 1847 that Godley was recruiting members of the Canterbury Association.

In 1848 an even greater controversy began and the tractarians, united and confident after the Hampden case, once more gave battle. Bishop Phillpotts of Exeter refused to institute the Reverend G. C. Gorham, an evangelical, into a living in his diocese because he did not hold the doctrine of unconditional baptismal regeneration. Gorham then asked the Court of Arches

to compel the bishop to institute. The two thorny issues at stake were whether Gorham was a heretic, and more important, whether the state or the church had the right to determine Gorham's orthodoxy. In late 1849 the Dean of Arches found in favour of Bishop Phillpotts. The effect of this decision was that a cornerstone of evangelical doctrine was declared to be heretical and it created the possibility of a mass secession of evangelicals from the Church of England. In this crisis, they promptly appealed to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council and found many allies rallying to their cause, especially those who feared the tractarians. The Judicial Committee of the Privy Council was a considerable problem for the tractarians, for with their stress on the spiritual autonomy of the church they doubted if it was legitimate to accept the ruling of a secular court.⁵ Whichever way the appeal decision went, the church would face an acute dilemma. If the court found for Phillpotts the evangelicals might secede, if it found for Gorham the tractarians might secede, or press for the disestablishment of the church. Of the mixture of bishops and lawyers who formed the bench at the trial two were Canterbury Association members: Archbishop Sumner and Bishop Blomfield. A majority of the judges found in favour of Gorham (Blomfield being amongst the dissenting members), and the tractarians were thrown into turmoil. Denied any official organs of protest, they responded with public protest meetings and an open letter to the Bishop of London signed by many prominent laymen and ecclesiastics.⁶ But the most important protest was a series of resolutions signed

5 The tractarians approved of the Court of Arches because it was a church court. Needless to say they approved also of its verdict.

6 Including Lord John Manners, a member of the Canterbury Association.

by such men as Archdeacon Manning, Archdeacon Robert Wilberforce and R. Cavendish declaring that the anglican church would be schismatic and lacking in divine authority unless the bishops or convocation rejected the Gorham judgement. Manning and his followers moved rapidly towards secession. Bishop Wilberforce threatened to excommunicate Archbishop Sumner if he obeyed the judgement, and Bishop Phillpotts threatened to excommunicate anyone who instituted Gorham into his living. But the vast majority of the tractarians were determined to remain within the anglican fold, and when Manning and Robert Wilberforce circulated a petition rejecting the royal supremacy, it received only a small measure of support. As the trickle of conversions to Rome began,⁷ the recalcitrant bishops backed down to save the unity of the church. At the biggest protest meeting (approximately 3,000 people) on ~~the~~ 23 July 1850 only one bishop could be persuaded to attend. Archbishop Sumner stood firm and Gorham was duly instituted. The tractarians had been badly beaten and by 1850 had lost much of the unity and confidence of a year ago. A few went to Rome (Simeon's brother in 1850, Robert Wilberforce in 1854),[^] some talked of a free episcopal church (Bishop Wilberforce threatened this in the Lords), but most remained loyal and anxious.

At the same time the second phase of the catholic revival was beginning in the parishes of England. Ritualism, as it came to be called, was concerned with catholic ceremonial and liturgy. Its outward manifestations were:

altar lights, vestments, wafer bread,
the mixed chalice (mixing a little
water with the wine at the communion),
making the sign of the cross, incense,
genu flexions, preaching in a surplice

7 Including Bishop Phillpott's chaplain.

instead of a black gown, surpliced
choirs, much singing and chanting, the
use of holy water, fixed stone altars,
instead of moveable wooden ones,
crucifixes and statues, cultus of the
Virgin Mary and Saints, reservation
and adoration of the eucharistic
sacrament, and auricular confession.⁸

It reflected an era of liturgical innovation, for in the latter half of the nineteenth century many clergymen besides the ritualists sought to improve the prayer book as a vehicle for worship. But anglo catholic ritualism had its own unique sources.

Chadwick points out that the taste of the age, with its elaborately furnished drawing rooms, was bound to be reflected in a desire for more elaborate church ornamentation and a close interest in the aesthetic possibilities of clerical dress and posture. An example of this is that in the late 1860's some English lay people began to give pastoral staffs to their bishops. Many bishops were reluctant to accept them but the donors thought them to be a historic and useful symbol and so they were adopted.

Ritualism was held to have an evangelistic function. It was widely believed in the Victorian era that one had to have elaborate ceremonial to draw in the town labourer. Slum pastors found their people repelled by the old uncongregational worship and believed that the people responded to worship which involved all their senses. The claim is hard to evaluate. It is true that anglo catholicism had some of its greatest successes in slum parishes in the east of London, but some observers believed that the self-sacrificing love of the priests attracted the poor rather than the ritual.

8 Vidler, Ch in Age of Rev., pp.157-158.

The growing congregationalism⁹ of town parishes meant that many people worshipped in churches outside the geographical area of their home parish because they were attracted by a preacher or a different kind of service. The laity had a wider variety of choice in service.

Many anglicans had a strong desire for due obedience to authority. To them the prevailing standard of worship was far below the positive requirements of the prayer book. Often the laity were as insistent upon eucharistic vestments, lighted candles on the altar and the eastward position of the celebrant as the clergy. For the great irony was that:

though the ritualistic churches began by aiming at the working man, they succeeded especially among the middle class... Evidently the movement nourished the devotional and aesthetic instinct of the educated more than it attracted the interest of the uneducated.¹⁰

Tractarian doctrine was another source of ritualism. The tractarians taught that the church is a sacred mystery, a holy fellowship in which the transcendent God is revealed in worship and sacrament. Their ritualist inheritors presented this teaching in a dramatic form by reviving traditional catholic worship. The ritualist priest did this by opting either for the sarum use (the ceremonial of the pre-reformation church in England) or the roman rite (a copying or modification of contemporary roman catholic ceremonial). The camden society had some part in these developments.

9 Congregationalism in this sense means that urban parishes were free to choose their own type of worship as the increasing pluralism of the age eroded anglican liturgical uniformity.

10 Chadwick, VI Ch. Part 11, p.317.

The revival of religious communities in the Church of England also contributed to the development of ritualism. But more important than this, it was one of the most remarkable results of anglo catholicism itself. The revival was a direct outcome of the indissoluble link between theology and spirituality in the lives of the tractarian leaders:

These men were dominated by two beliefs; first a belief in the identity of the Church of England with the Catholic Church of earlier ages, and a determination to reaffirm this identity, and second-ly a belief in and longing for holiness, for a holiness which they believed Catholicism alone could produce.¹¹

Under Pusey's direction the first permanent anglican religious community, the Park Village Sisterhood, was formed in 1845 and female religious communities proliferated rapidly after that. Male religious communities made a slower start but the formation of the Society of St John the Evangelist in 1865 marked the beginnings of the slow but steady growth of such communities. These communities were in part a response to the social problems of the rapidly expanding industrial cities where the church, unable to cope with a massive influx of landless poor from the countryside, was rapidly losing its hold over the working class. There was a great need for collegiate bodies of dedicated, unmarried and unpaid christians who could meet this need. But more than this, the anglo catholics believed that:

by bringing back into existance a type of life unknown in the Church of England since the

11 Allchin, Sil Reb. p.52.

Reformation, and universally regarded as a distinctive mark of Catholicism, they differentiated that Church from the rest of Protestant Christendom and asserted its affinity to the Catholic and Orthodox world.¹²

It was these religious communities that gave anglo catholicism an opportunity to develop and display the full range and power of its distinctive spirituality. Therein frequent communion and regular confession was practised, and the full round of liturgical prayer, based on the offices, was reintroduced:

And by means of retreats, and the general influence and example of their life, a gradual but widespread growth in understanding of the spiritual life could take place in the Church.¹³

The chapels of the religious communities provided the liturgical workshops of ritualism in which it was found that the prayer book was not adequate for their needs¹⁴ and extensive borrowings were made from pre-reformation and contemporary roman sources. They could carry out some of the more extreme practices secure in the knowledge that no protestant agitator or bishop would hear of it.

Dr Vidler sums up the essence of ritualism in a paragraph which explains the success of the movement:

It must be emphasized that Ritualism was not merely a matter of external rites and ceremonies. It was felt to symbolize and safeguard deep

12 Allchin, Sil Reb, p. 54.

13 Allchin, Sil Reb, p. 55.

14 It does not have the seven monastic offices of prayer.

doctrinal convictions, especially about the presence of Christ in the eucharist. The strength of Ritualism lay in its devout sacramentalism and its encouragement of a disciplined and winning spirituality that seemed to be lacking in ordinary, conventional Anglicanism.¹⁵

Ritualism was bitterly resisted both within and without the church throughout the nineteenth century. Vidler discerns four main reasons for this. Firstly, the English are conservative in matters of religion and are inclined to view innovations with suspicion. Secondly, the ordinary Englishman thinks he likes simplicity in religion and therefore disliked the elaboration and sophistication of ritualism. Thirdly, the English have a great respect for the law and the ritualists seemed to be law breakers. The tenor of legal decisions in cases involving ritual prosecutions was confused but in the main anti-ritualist and so many suspected anglo catholic clergy of breaking their oaths of canonical obedience to their bishops. But the most serious cause of opposition to ritualism was the fear that it was dragging the Church of England back into the roman obedience. "No Popery" had always been a powerful cry throughout English history and events in mid victorian England alarmed many anglican churchmen. Just as the Gorham controversy was coming to an end in 1850, Pope Pius IX restored a roman catholic hierarchy and dioceses in England. The newly created Cardinal Wiseman, flushed with enthusiasm, issued his famous pastoral letter, From out of the Flaminian Gate of Rome. Purporting to be a letter of congratulations to the faithful it seemed to many protestant Englishmen to be an open defiance and challenge to the established church.

15 Vidler, Ch in Age of Rev., p.160.

"No Popery" riots occurred throughout the country and feeling was running high when Lord John Russell, the prime minister, clumsily expressed the popular mind in an open letter to the Bishop of Durham:

Mr dear Lord, I agree with you in considering the "late aggression of the Pope upon our Protestantism" as "insolent and insidious", and I therefore feel as indignant as you can do upon the subject...

He went on to attack ritualist clergy:

Clergymen of our own Church, who have subscribed to the Thirty-nine Articles, and acknowledged in explicit terms the Queen's supremacy, have been the most forward in leading their flocks, step by step, to the very verge of the precipice

The letter provoked a fierce persecution of anglo catholics.

The battle over ritualism produced two religious associations. The English Church Union was formed in 1859 to extend catholic principles throughout the Church of England and championed many priests during litigation trials. In 1865 leading evangelical churchmen formed the Church Association to resist by legal action the development of ritualism. But this course of action had many disadvantages. On the one hand the laity were not impressed by clergymen being taken to court and even imprisoned and on the other hand the ritualist clergy refused to recognise the authority of the Court of Appeal. Moreover the formularies of the church were broader, more comprehensive and more ambiguous than the narrow limits desired by the Church Association. Either they had to prosecute a man for doing what the prayer book decreed or try and change the rubrics of the Church of England. No-one with any pastoral sense would want to see such a loss of

freedom within the church.

The two great periods of persecution were from 1867 to 1874 and from 1899 to 1903. They were sparked off by political upheavals in the life of the nation and by the opportunism of political enemies of the established church. The bishops, realising that any restrictive legislation would cause schism and contempt for the law, side-tracked attempts at any such legislation into commission or committees. But in 1874 the bishops were obliged to allow a Public Worship Regulation Act to pass into law in order to prevent the adoption of more extreme measures. It did not alter the formularies of worship but speeded up the machinery for enforcing them.

The ineffectiveness of the Public Worship Regulation Act was soon apparent when some ritualist clergymen ignored it, were imprisoned, and became public martyrs. Prosecutions had to be stopped for the peace of the church. Further restrictive legislation would only drive ritualist clergy into more extreme positions, abolishing the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council was unacceptable to most Englishmen, and persuasion would not stop the Church Association from prosecuting. Instead the bishops decided to use their veto to prevent prosecutions. It was only an interim solution but it had far reaching effects. The bishops adopted a pastoral rather than a legal attitude to the problems of worship in which their advice and direction brought peace to the church and stopped the imprisonment of zealous parish clergy. The toleration and comprehensiveness of the church was considerably increased. It was also possible that the bishops might be prosecuted for protecting ritualist clergy.

In 1888 the Church Association, frustrated in its object of prosecuting ritualists by the episcopal veto, tried to turn the bishops' flank by prosecuting Bishop Edward King of Lincoln for ritual irregular-

-ities. The Archbishop's judgement was given in 1890 and was a moral victory for the anglo catholics. Although King was ordered to desist from a number of ritual practices most of the charges against him were dismissed. The evangelical party campaign and the Church Association withered under the disapproval of a majority of moderate churchmen.

By now the anglo catholics had reached the summit of their influence, many of their leaders being elevated to high ecclesiastical positions. The Lincoln judgement and the bishop's veto gave adequate security for the moderate extension of new ceremonial innovations. Alarmed advocates of protestantism began a programme of sustained public agitation which by the late 1890's had helped to make English public opinion receptive to another outburst of anti-ritualist persecutions. The agitation spread to parliament where a group of protestant M. P's demanded that ritualist lawbreakers be suppressed. But the ritualists could be halted neither by the moral authority of the Archbishops nor by the courts. Between 1899 and 1904 protestant parliamentarians tried to eliminate the ritualists and narrow the formularies of the church, either by abolishing the bishops' veto, or by bringing in new laws for the church. In 1904, parliamentary pressure to form a Select Committee of the House of Commons to consider and remedy clerical defiance of the law became overwhelming. The proposal was so nakedly erastian that it would have led to the disestablishment of the Church of England if carried into effect. The Archbishop of Canterbury hastily intervened to persuade the prime minister to form a Royal Commission instead, which, since it had the authority of the King, would be grudgingly accepted by anglo catholics. The commission deliberated for two years and eventually published a massive report with two main conclusions:

First, the law of public worship in the Church of England is too narrow for the religious life of the present generation. It needlessly condemns much which a great section of church people, including many of her most devoted members, value; and modern thought and feeling are characterized by a care for ceremonial, a sense of dignity in worship, and an appreciation of the continuity of the Church, which were not similarly felt when the law took its present shape. In an age which has witnessed an extraordinary revival of spiritual life and activity, the Church has had to work under regulations fitted for a different condition of things, without the power of self adjustment which is inherent in the conception of a living church... Secondly, the machinery for discipline has broken down. The means of enforcing the law in the Ecclesiastical Courts, even in matters which touch the Church's faith and teaching, are defective and in some respects unsuitable.¹⁶

The year 1906 marks the end of the great persecutions of ritualists and the use of secular courts and state authority to enforce uniformity of public worship in the Church of England.

The tractarian phase of anglo catholicism was a doctrinal failure. Although it made a creative re-statement of the doctrine of the church and its sacraments, it was essentially fundamentalist and

conservative in its reaction to Darwin's evolutionary science and to the new German biblical criticism. This theological archaism of anglo catholicism was remedied in 1889 with the publication of Lux Mundi, a collection of theological essays written by a group of distinguished young anglo catholic theologians. Their leaders were Charles Gore and Henry Scott Holland. The two decisive emphases of this new school were their liberal and flexible approach to the interpretation of the bible (particularly the old testament) and their advocacy of christian socialism as a means of vigorously attacking the political and social problems of the day. This was the third phase, of liberal catholicism, which was bitterly resisted by first generation tractarians, but came to be accepted by the anglo catholic movement as a whole.

The term anglo catholicism was first used in the 1840's with reference to the tractarians. However the tractarians were more commonly referred to by the derogatory term puseyites. In the 1850's and 1860's the meaning of anglo catholicism was widened to include the ceremonialists, who were more commonly referred to as ritualists. Liberal catholicism, or the lux mundi school, represents a third phase of anglo catholicism, which because it was a theological movement which generally affected only the clergy, did not attract any nicknames. Nor did it dominate the theological outlook of all anglo catholic clergy. Many second generation ritualists were completely opposed to it. By the early twentieth century all anglo catholics were lumped together in the popular mind as high churchmen, but, as we have seen, this term is neither historically accurate nor helpful. Thus by the early 1900's anglo catholicism had been accepted into the main stream of anglican life and development and had expanded in its meaning several times.

CHAPTER 11

THE CANTERBURY ASSOCIATION

In December 1847, Edward Gibbon Wakefield wrote to John Robert Godley, his new-found partner in the Canterbury colonial venture:

... I am ... desirous of adverting to the question of party in the Church, which everybody mentions to me whenever I talk on the subject of this religious project. The more I reflect, the more I am disposed to agree with you, that it will be impossible to avoid a party colour. I see that though a Society of neutral colour might be formed, it would be inefficient by reason of the want of harmony, or, at any rate, of earnest co-operation, amongst its members. But neither am I blind to the evil tendency of a decided party colour. In favour of it there is the earnestness, without which nothing very good can be accomplished: against it, there is the narrowness of the field in which you would work, and the advantage which would be given to the opponents of the plan. The evangelical party will oppose it at all events; and if they were able to show distinctly that it was a "Puseyite" scheme, their opposition would be very formidable, because it would more or less obtain the

sympathy of those religious men and good Churchmen who are neither Puseyite nor Evangelical. What I anxiously desire, therefore, is that the Society may comprise persons of mark who are not deemed Puseyites; that in forming it, your skill and policy may enable you to steer clear of a personnel which would stamp it at once with a Puseyite character... Surely the Church comprises many eminent persons, lay and clerical, who are both earnest Churchmen and friends of colonization, and yet not members of the Puseyite or Tractarian party: I would name, for example, (W.E.) Gladstone and the Bishop of Oxford (S. Wilberforce). Along with a good many such persons, it matters not how many Puseyites; nay, the more the better; but without them, I fear that the anti-colonizing evangelicals would prove too strong for you. The Puseyite party alone cannot do the thing; can it? If not, let us beware of a failure from taking too narrow a position... What is wanted, is a due combination of zeal and power. What we have to guard against, is a sacrifice of the power for the sake of the zeal... It will be enough if you would share my conviction that conspicuous exclusive Puseyism, or any other Ism, would land us in a failure. Whatever the fact may be - how much so ever we may rely on the earnestness of the most earnest Churchmen who are not anti-colonizers- let no one be able to say without being contradicted, "It is altogether a Puseyite affair:

look at the names?" ¹

The letter brings out the theme of this chapter: the relationship between the Oxford movement and the Canterbury Association. The chapter is an investigation of the history and membership of the Canterbury Association and its connection with the spread of tractarianism in the Church of England.

Wakefield was not a churchman. His religion was not particularly orthodox and he involved the anglican church in the Canterbury project as a means to an end. It is to John Robert Godley, the co-founder of the Canterbury Association, that we must mainly look for the source of tractarian ideology in this colonial project.

Born into the Anglo-Irish aristocracy, he was an undergraduate at Oxford when Newman was in his hey-day. Although much of his time at University was spent in the traditional non-academic pursuits of riding to hounds and undergraduate dinner parties, he possessed a serious and capable mind, which turned its attention to the Tracts for the Times, during his later leisured life on his Irish estates. Writing to his friend C. B. Adderley in 1841, he summarised his religious views in these terms:

Many of the questions at present under discussion are, I think, intimately connected with the duties and practices of individual Christians, so I really think we have unconsciously slid into such extremely lax notions upon what are commonly called Church matters, that a movement of the kind that has been made at Oxford had become absolutely necessary, and has been,

1 Wa to Go, 17 Dec 1847: Founders of Canterbury, Vol 1. pp. 11-13.

in spite of the disputes to which it has given rise, highly beneficial to the Church. You must not think, from what I have said, that I am an unqualified admirer of the Tracts, and all the doctrines contained in them; on the contrary, I think that the writers have, by a perhaps natural reaction from what they perceived to be the rationalistic and latitudinarian tendency of the age, been driven in many instances to a contrary excess, and I am sure that in many of their views they approximate fully as much to the Church of Rome as to the Church of England; but still I like, on the whole, the tendency of their writings. I prefer superstition to scepticism, an undue regard for forms to a neglect of them, and I think the spirit of the age so much more inclined to Ultra-Protestant than to Roman Catholic errors that I look with less apprehension on what seems to savour of the latter than the former.²

Throughout the first half of the 1840's Godley's correspondence with his father and Adderley was full of theological topics such as tradition, faith and works, the role of scripture, the place of the sacraments. On each of these matters Godley faithfully defended Newman's position and sought to bring his correspondents to a similar point of view.

But although Godley's way of life may have been leisured and affluent, it was not secure. The prominent place of his name on a Fenian murder list

2 Go to Ad, 29 Mar 1841: Godley-Adderley Letters
pp. 17-18.

obliged Godley to go armed about his estates and to lead night-time militia patrols over the roads of the area. The stormy nature of contemporary British politics, coupled with a deep interest in the colonization of Canada by poor Irish emigrants changed Godley's tractarian ideology into what may be called "political Puseyism". The firm conviction that he was living in a time of the crisis of civilization shifted Godley's interests away from the religious and doctrinal aspects of tractarianism to its social and political implications. Analysing the state of British society in 1843 Godley wrote:

I have long thought that the age of equality is coming upon us, and that our business is not so much to struggle against it, with a view to repulse it altogether, as to retard its progress, and to modify its effects; at present we are not ready for it. I think no man can look upon the state of our working classes, their ignorance in all which it is important for them to know, the immense space which divides them in habits, tastes, pursuits, and feelings from the rich, above all, the wide spread indifference to religious obligations, without trembling at the thought of their speedily acquiring political power. Our object, then, should be to refuse it them, as yet, while we earnestly endeavour to remove the disqualifications, which I have mentioned. Nationally and individually, Church and State, landlord and capitalist, all should join heart and hand

in this great work, preparing the way for a safe democracy.³

Here we see the strong tory and aristocratic strands in Godley's political thinking and his fear of popular power whether through an extension of the franchise or by violent revolution. He was appalled by the similarities in the extremes of wealth in post-reform bill Britain and pre-revolutionary France, and believed that the time of revolution could not be far off. Godley believed whig landlords and aristocrats to be responsible for a reckless pursuit of wealth, extravagance and luxury to the detriment of social obligation. And the effect on society of this had been that:

... Loyalty has passed away; respect for birth and family attachments are rapidly vanishing, too, and it is daily becoming more obvious that the rich govern England.⁴

In looking for a solution Godley decided that: our best hope lies in the conduct not of the state but of individuals. The grand object to which we should all devote ourselves is the improvement in the condition of the lower classes, their improvement physically and morally, and a cultivation of mutual sympathy and good feeling with them; the landlord should, if necessary, lower his rents, the farmer increase his wages, and the manufacturer diminish his hours of work.⁵

3 Go to Ad, 21 Jan 1843, Godley-Adderley Letters p.33

4 Go to Ad, 21 Jan 1843, Godley-Adderley Letters p.34.

5 Go to Ad, 21 Jan 1843, Godley-Adderley Letters, p.35.

And out of this came Godley's vision of a pious and just, hierachical society in which wealth ceased to determine social position and the privileged protected the weak. This is where the church and its tractarian reformers came in. As well as better conditions for the labouring classes:

A far more important object is their moral and religious education. It is vain now to regret the miserable apathy and neglect of generations gone by, by which the poor have been too long taught to look upon the Establishment as being the rich man's church. It must be our task to grapple with the herculean task of trying to repair the deficiency, and if there is one feature in our project which may encourage us to hope that God is preparing in time a corrective to the coming evils, it is surely the increased zeal and energy which (at the last moment, as it were) have sprung up, and above all the direction which they have taken. It would occupy far too much time and space to attempt to point out the features which render the ecclesiastical "movement" of the last ten years peculiarly adapted to act as a corrective to the evils which we have to dread. You will at once see that the more important of them, the denunciation of luxury, and even wealth itself as an evil - a doctrine which though inculcated in scripture in the strongest manner, has practically passed away from our creed - the recommendation of austerity

and self-denial, the exhortation to alms-giving and recognition of the rights of the poor, all this is just what we want, while to the poor is preached respect to authority, unquestioning faith, humility, resignation - all that is opposed to the spirit of wild and licentious democracy, which seems to threaten us. Now that a school, professing doctrines such as these, opposed as they are to the spirit of the age, should have made such a marvellous progress among us as to promise at no very distant period to absorb all the talent, piety and influence of the Church, is surely a sign that there is universally felt a consciousness of something wrong, and a want of such a corrective as an overruling Providence seems graciously to vouchsafe at our uttermost need.⁶

But the other side of Godley's vision was one of such apocalyptic gloom that he feared that the tractarian revival might not save the tradition and authority to which he was so attached:

But, alas! the state of society which has been created cannot be got rid of; a concentrated and redundant population has been created, the church in the hour of her slumbers has been distanced by it, and a decline of wealth constitutes now the plunging into misery of millions, the drag is off the wheel, and our only chance is to keep the horses out of the way of the coach.⁷

6 Go to Ad, 21 Jan 1843, Godley-Adderley Letters, pp 36

7 Go to Ad, 21 Jan 1843, Godley-Adderley Letters, p.35.

From this social pessimism came Godley's deep interest in colonization. It might be possible for civilisation to start afresh in remote areas of the world where church and society could renew themselves:

who knows whether you and I may
not be destined some day or other
to wield an axe or spade in a
Canadian forest, like the emigrants,
of 92, if the democratic principles
now advancing shall be forced into
action by commercial distress, and
sweep away order, civilisation,
society-everything. ⁸

These conclusions which Godley had drawn from the state of the English society made him extremely receptive to Wakefield's invitation to co-found the Canterbury project. As he went about recruiting members for the Canterbury Association in late 1847 and early 1848 he came to share his partner's concern about the churchmanship of those involved in this new colonial venture. He agreed with Wakefield, that on the one hand the success of the Canterbury project depended upon the energy, ideas and enthusiasm of tractarians, but that on the other hand an exclusively tractarian Canterbury Association would generate such ecclesiastical opposition that the project would come to nothing. To Adderley in 1848 Godley wrote:

My present business is to procure a certain number of good and creditable names with which to go before the public as our Committee of Management. I do not want them to be taken mainly from any one party in the Church, but wish to have a broad basis, composed of those who wish the Church well, and are known as

8 Go to Ad, 21 Jan 1843, (Quoted in A History of Canterbury, Vol 1, p.137)

zealous in her interests, without holding extreme views.⁹

Before investigating the people recruited onto the Canterbury Association it is worthwhile noting that many were purely nominal members of that body. Often membership meant little more than consenting to have one's name on the Association's list, and contributing a little money. The decisions were made by the Management Committee, which comprised just under one quarter of the membership list. Attendances varied considerably from one meeting to another. Some men who are of especial interest to us, such as Dr W. F. Hook and Bishop S. Wilberforce, only attended one or two such meetings. However some of such mounted public platforms throughout the country to promote the Canterbury settlement, and Bishop Wilberforce was amongst those who rendered this invaluable service to the Association.

An interesting feature of the Canterbury Association was the wide range of its membership. Many of its members had been on opposite sides of the fence during the ecclesiastical struggles sparked off by the Oxford movement. The Gorham case was at its height from 1848 to 1850 and most of its leading protagonists shared a common membership of the Association.

The tractarian party was represented by a small but highly influential group of men. Its leading layman was Lord John Manners. An aristocrat and tory M.P., he was the living embodiment of the influence of romanticism on the Oxford movement, particularly through his passionate attachment to the romantic toryism of the Young England party:

Manners propagated a Toryism which valued the feudal link of lord and tenant and distrusted the middle class. He expected the church to

9 Go to Ad, 16 Jan 1848, Godley-Adderley Letters, p. 124.

save society from the materialism of modern industry, to rouse the gentlemen of the land to their responsibilities towards the masses.¹⁰

Godley was not the only exponent of "political Puseyism". There was also the ideology of that small group of tory backbenchers (including Disraeli) known as the Young England party which sought to promote a benevolent hierarchical system against the Benthamite utilitarianism which threatened the power of the aristocracy. It has been described as:

the Oxford movement translated by Cambridge from religion into politics.¹¹

Manners was profoundly influenced by the tractarian Frederick Faber and was an assiduous devotee of lost causes. The most notable example of this was when he supported Ambrose Phillips De Lisle's proposal for an anglican union with Rome:

-the present clergy to retain their wives and livings, appointing Curates to administer the Sacrament.¹²

His debut in public life began in 1841 when he became a parliamentary member of Peel's new tory party. Manner's tractarianism made him an enemy of Peel, for tractarian attacks on the Royal Supremacy had threatened the old connection between high churchmen and the tory party. He also played an important part in the beginnings of anglican monasticism. In 1844, with the help of an influential group of men, including Lord Lyttelton, Pusey, Hook and Gladstone, Manners founded at Park Village West the first community of anglican sisters. In 1847 the appointment of Dr Hampden to

10 Chad, Vi Ch, Part 1, p. 222.

11 Blake, Disraeli, p. 171.

12 Quoted in Whibley, Lord John Manners, Vol 1, p. 253.

the Bishopric of Manchester inspired Lord John Manners to verse in which he prayed that the spirit of truth would upraise some man of God:

Who, strong in conscious rectitude, shall dare
Resist the flagrant outrage, which repays
The church's long obedience with the rod
of state oppression.¹³

And in 1850, at the height of the protest over the Gorham judgement, he joined sixty three eminent laymen in publishing an open letter to the Bishop of London¹⁴ declaring that the Church of England was in danger, the judicial committee was unfit, and asking his Lordship to take counsel with other bishops.

Dr Hook was one of the tractarians leading clerical allies in the Canterbury Association. Possessed of strong catholic convictions before the tractarian revival, he was with it but not of it. A churchman of considerable ability, he revolutionised anglican pastoral practice by an extremely successful ministry to the people of the industrial city of Leeds. He had introduced such practices as frequent celebrations of the holy communion and services on saints days before the tractarian revival began and was quite ready to adopt their ideas. His new church of St Saviours, Leeds was a showpiece of camden society principles with its gothic architecture and surpliced choir in the chancel. But he was not an uncritical admirer of the tractarians and was as much against popery as puritanism. Although abused as being a tractarian he had in fact been a fervent supporter of the Jerusalem Bishopric, intensely disliked Ward's Ideal of the Christian Church and refused to join the campaign against Hampden in 1847. His support for Newman's Tract 90 was reluctant and he was incensed when some of the assistant

13 Chad, Vi Ch, Part 1, p. 238.

14 Bishop Blomfield was a fellow-member of the Canterbury Association.

clergy and laity of St Saviours defected to Rome in 1846. He was thus a man of catholic but independent churchmanship, whom the discerning recognised as a moderate tractarian sympathiser, staunch in his defence of the anglican establishment.

Archdeacon Robert Wilberforce had been a friend and colleague of Pusey, Keble, Newman and Froude since the 1820's and as a scholar and theologian of some repute was widely acknowledged to be a leading tractarian. Brother to Bishop Samuel Wilberforce, he was also the friend and confessor of Archdeacon Manning, whose conversion to Rome ^{he} tried to prevent. He joined the Canterbury Association early in 1848 but his attention was soon to be completely occupied by the Gorham judgement. Wilberforce and Manning led the extreme section of the tractarians who threatened to secede if the bishops did not reverse the Gorham judgement and reject the Royal Supremacy. Their failure to bring the rest of the tractarian party to share this point of view led his brother, Henry Wilberforce, and the future Cardinal Manning to secede to Rome in 1850. Pressure from his wife, and from his brother, Bishop Samuel Wilberforce, kept the distracted and confused archdeacon in the anglican obedience for a further four years, but in 1854, as the Canterbury Association was winding up its affairs, Robert Wilberforce acceded to Manning's pleas and defected to Rome.

Other members whom the tractarians might have counted as being supporters or sympathisers were J. R. Godley, Sir J. T. Coleridge and his son J. D. Coleridge, Sir W. Heathcote, Bart, R. Cavendish, M.P; the Earl of Lincoln and the Right Honourable Sidney Herbert, M.P; the Dean of Canterbury (W. R. Lyall), Lord Lyttelton, J. C. Talbot, M.P; W. Vaux, the Reverend N. Wade and the Reverend R. C. Trench.¹⁵

¹⁵ See appendix A

The evangelical party was small but extremely powerful and bitterly anti-tractarian. John Bird Sumner, a moderate evangelical, was elevated from the See of Chester to the Archbishopric of Canterbury in February 1848, and shortly afterwards became President of the Canterbury Association. A gentle and amiable man, he was not a forceful Archbishop of Canterbury but he had crossed swords with the tractarians on former occasions. He was the first bishop to oppose the tractarians when in 1838 he denounced:

the undermining of the foundations
of our Protestant Church by men
who dwell within her walls.
and the bad faith of those:

who sit in the Reformers seat
and traduce the Reformation.¹⁶

In turn the tractarians despised Sumner as a spineless heretic for consecrating Hampden and speaking in vindication of Gorham in the appeal court of the Privy Council.

His brother, Bishop C. R. Sumner of Winchester, was also a moderate evangelical and member of the Canterbury Association. He approved of some of the tracts and opposed Hampden's Bishopric, but refused to ordain Keble's curate because he (the curate) was an adherent of tract 90.

Lord Ashley (soon afterwards Lord Shaftesbury), the great philanthropist, was the most prominent evangelical layman in an age which saw the apogee of evangelical influence in English society. His qualities of toughness, perseverance, courage, and his considerable influence made him the most doughty opponent of tractarianism in the land.

Lastly there was John Hutt, former governor of Western Australia, and for a time chairman of the

16 Quoted in Dean R. W. Church's, The Oxford Movement, p. 251.

Canterbury Association. He was an evangelical, reputedly influenced by the Clapham sect.¹⁷

The rest of the bishops in the Association represented a variety of clerical shades of opinion. Archbishop R Whately of Dublin, Bishop S Hinds of Norwich (Management Committee) and Bishop C Thirlwall of St Davids were liberals, anti-evangelical and anti-tractarian in outlook. Bishop C. T. Longley of Ripon, and Bishop W. H. Coleridge, former Bishop of Barbadoes, were men of no particular party opinion.

Phillpots of Exeter, the warrior bishop who had sparked off the Gorham controversy and had threatened to withhold communion from Archbishop Sumner in 1850, shared membership of the Association with his "heretical" Archbishop.

He is described as being:

a high churchman of the school which preceeded the Oxford movement, and though often ranked on the Anglo-Catholic side, he never identified himself with that party, despite his pronounced hostility to its opponents.¹⁸

Bishop Wilberforce of Oxford was a powerful personality, a very effective bishop, and a fighter. He gained his reputation for militancy as a result of his inept intervention in the Hampden affair. A high churchman of independent views he disapproved of ritualism but was quick to see in the anglo catholic movement a means of infusing new life into the church. Like Phillpots, he sponsored the development of anglican sisterhoods. In 1854 he founded Cuddleston, the first anglican theological college with a common life and a tractarian principal. By the late 1850's

17 Robert Glen, "The Work of the Canterbury Association in England, 1848-56", p. 102.

18 D N B, Vol XV, p. 1111.

his ready defence of anglo catholic clergy had made him the episcopal champion of the tractarians.

Bishop Blomfield of London was autocratic, hard working, and an old fashioned 18th century type of bishop. A decidedly non party man, he denounced the "Tridentine colouring" of the tracts while praising the tractarians revival of neglected prayer book usages. His attempt to define precisely the ritual rubrics in 1842 sparked off the "surplice riots" throughout the diocese of London.

In fact, a majority of the members of the Canterbury Association were moderate churchmen who did not belong to any particular party. Four such men, all members of the Management Committee and therefore at the heart of the Association's activities, illustrate the diversity of opinions held by the moderates. Henry Selfe Selfe was not only a member of the Management Committee but he was also a prominent figure in the Canterbury judiciary. It has been pointed out that one of Selfe's most valuable assets to the Association was that he:

was not tainted by personal or family connexions with Tractarianism; indeed, his brother-in-law, Tait, (later Archbishop of Canterbury) was known as a moderate but decided opponent of the Anglo-Catholic movement. Thus his appointment to a high office in Canterbury would help the Association rid itself of the stigma of being nothing more than an offshoot of Puseyism... Many years later Selfe explained his religious views and how they related to the Canterbury scheme: "Mr Selfe ... said he must remind the meeting at the outset that he was not associated with those whose aim and object it had been to make Canterbury a

Church Settlement and that he did not profess to have any great sympathy with such a scheme. He had however become more of a Churchman from the friendships he had formed with those who were among the founders of Canterbury, although he had not identified himself in any way with either party in the Church. His interest in ecclesiastical questions was mainly confined to those who might be called practical; and his views were such as might be expected from a lawyer and a layman who was not what would be called an enthusiastic Churchman".¹⁹

C. B. Adderley, an aristocratic tory M.P., was brought up in an atmosphere of deep evangelical devotion and was a strong churchman who rose above party feeling. Always interested in reconciling apparently opposing religious forces he:

advocated in 1889 a union between the Church of England and the Wesleyans, and he developed an aspiration to heal protestant schism and stay controversy in "High and Low Church".²⁰

The Reverend G. R. Gleig was Chaplain-general to the forces and was more interested in military history than church party conflict. G. K. Rickards was an Oxford academic and political economist. A non-party churchman, his ecclesiastical interests lay in the field of administration and finance.

When selected as deputy chairman of the Management Committee, Wakefield said of Henry Sewell that he

19 Report of a meeting of 17 Feb 1868 in LT, 12 Feb 1868. Quoted in R. L. N. Greenaway's, "Henry Selfe Selfe and the origins and early development of Canterbury", p. 20

20 D N B, Second supplement, 1901 -1911, p.20

had:

no defect that I know of unless his
Puseyite name should prove hurtful.²¹

In fact Sewell was not a tractarian but he gained his reputation from his eccentric brother, the Reverend William Sewell. William had known Pusey, Keble and Newman well and in the first phase of the tractarian movement had been one of its ablest members. But he left the movement in 1842, frightened off by the romanticising tendencies exhibited in tract 90. It is difficult to be certain about Henry Sewell's churchmanship, though he did reveal his mind to some extent in the debate over Bishop Selwyn's proposed New Zealand church constitution. Bishop Selwyn borrowed extensively from the American episcopal church to produce a constitution which included a revolutionary clause:

That the bishops, clergy and laity
shall be three distinct orders, the
consent of all which shall be necessary to all acts binding upon
the church at large.²²

Sewell was opposed to the laity having power over spiritual matters, particularly as the communion test was not applied as a test of membership of the church. This was:

sacrificing the Catholicity of the
Church to a mere hobby of self-government.²³

Sewell's objection to the role of the laity in the decision-making process had been refuted by a tract of Newman entitled On consulting the Laity in matters of Faith. In it Newman pointed out that in the Arian controversy the laity had prevented the bishops and clergy from adopting the Arian heresy. Sewell's concern

21 Wa to Go, 22 June 1850; Founders, Vol 1, p. 293

22 Quoted in J. H. Evans, Churchman Militant, p.140.

23 Henry Sewell's journal, 3 May 1853, p.216.

for the "Catholic basis" of the Church and for clerical control of the church's spiritual affairs suggests to me that he was an old fashioned high churchman.

The rest of the story concerning the relationship between the Oxford movement and the Canterbury project is revealed by an examination of certain important papers and events. There is very little material to be found on this topic in the official papers of the Canterbury Association. The members were extremely practical about the business in hand and even Godley's private correspondence of the 1850s shows a sudden loss of interest in doctrinal questions and only an occasional and practical interest in the great ecclesiastical controversies of the day.

Previous writers on this subject have usually pointed to the Reverend J. C. Wynter's publicity pamphlet Hints on Church Colonization as a tractarian manifesto reflecting the views of the Association's supporters. In it he asked;

Is the Church to stand aloof,
a cold, dignified, unimpassioned
spectatrix of the solution of this
great knot of juncture in England's
destinies? ... Henceforth let the
church colonize itself... Strong
in the strength of her Lord, let her
become a leader, not a tardy attend-
-ant; let her go forth; for shame's
sake let her no longer be dragged
forth.

He pressed his readers to copy the model of the Patristic Church and send a complete diocesan organisation overseas to Canterbury:

The Apostles did not plant Churches
by dribblets, fragments, instalments-
but by gathering together the seper-
-ate members into one body under one
common, visible head. They planted
the Church entire; they did not plant

episcopacy without a bishop.²⁴

The only problem with this view is the churchmanship of Wynter himself. Wakefield, in his search for a moderate Bishop of Canterbury who would offend neither high church nor evangelical party, seized on J. C. Wynter, Rector of Gatton, as being:

sufficiently latitudinarian in outlook.²⁵

He described a Gatton parishioner's reaction to his Rector thus:

If you ask whether he is a
Puseyite, or Low Churchman, or
High Churchman, or what not,
the catechist looks puzzled
and says - "he doesn't know;
he never heard." ²⁶

Hardly the sort of man to produce a tractarian manifesto.

However, a wide section of English public opinion was convinced that the Canterbury Association was sponsoring a Puseyite project. It was the prevalence of this attitude that obliged The New Zealand Journal to take a sarcastic journalist to task:

The berths of the labouring
emigrants in the ships about
to sail for Port Lyttelton are
wider than usual. We are not
surprised, says our punning brother,
that a "wide berth" should be
given to these fanatical and bigoted
Tractarians, who are going out
to New Zealand to worship the
God "Prer-Bok" (Prayer Book)
-on "Poozee "Pusey) Heights."
The principle of this joke is,

24 J. C. Wynter, Hints on Church Colonization: in Canterbury Papers pp 48-49.

25 Founders, Introduction by Peter Burroughs, p. XXIV.

26 Wa to Bish of Norwich, 10 Feb 1850: Founders p. 216.

to get the dog hanged by giving
him a bad name.²⁷

The years 1850 and 1851 were the years of crisis in which bitter anti-catholic feeling created considerable problems for the Canterbury Association. Wakefield was well aware of this feeling as he intrigued behind the scenes of the Management Committee meetings. In February 1850 he wrote:

The chief impediment now- the
only thing I believe, that prevents
a large success - is the wide-spread
notion that this a Papistical project...
At Clapham - the main seat of anti-
Popery - they have it that John Hutt,
who is known to lean their way in
theological views, is made Chairman
for a blind, being himself a dupe
of the Jesuits who really direct
at Charing Cross. The seal of the
Association is Papistical.

Well, all this, monstrous nonsense
as it is, goes about and is believed
as truth. Nothing will put it
down but the selection of a Bishop.²⁸

The selection of a bishop for Canterbury was a major pre-occupation of Wakefield and the Association during the first half of 1850. It was a particularly difficult problem because few clergymen wanted to become colonial bishops, and because of the differing expectations of various members of the Association. The Coleridges and their supporters wanted a man appointed who would be congenial to Bishop Selwyn, who was widely and incorrectly believed to be a

27 Quoted in The New Zealand Journal, 7 Sept 1850,
p. 216.

28 Wa to Wyn, 22 Feb 1850, Founders, pp 219.220.

Puseyite. This caused consternation among the evangelicals. Richard Cavendish wrote to Lord Lyttelton: I think therefore it as well you should be reminded of the fact that Hutt and some others are very anxious to nominate a Bishop at once because they think that by so doing they will promote the sale of land. Hutt talked to me a great deal on the subject, and I gather from him that the chief thing with regard to the selection of a Bishop about which he is anxious is that he should not be a puseyite and that his idea of a puseyite is embodied in the person of Selwyn... One reason for Hutt desiring to get a non-puseyite bishop appointed at once is to calm the alarm of some Evangelical intending colonists.²⁹

Cavendish went on to say that if the evangelicals were allowed to pick the bishop they would select a man so antagonistic to Selwyn that it would be worse than having no bishop at all. He suggested that the way out of this impasse was for Lyttelton to find a man without the puseyite label:

on whose principles we might rely although he was sceptical that a man with the qualities of a second Selwyn could be found quickly. Godley had already considered the problem and decided that he wanted:

a sober enthusiast. Lyttelton is the only man to manage it, because it will shock the Coleridge party excessively

to go on without waiting for
Selwyns decision.³⁰

Never one to be left out of these things, Wakefield
had decided that he wanted:

a statesman-bishop, a man of social
standing and of good private
property.³¹

In 1849 he had plumped for the Reverend J. C. Wynter
as a man ideal in all respects, but unfortunately (Mr
Wynter's timid nature, coupled with his wife's absol-
-ute refusal to face the hardships of colonial life,
had put this candidate out of the running by early
1850. By now the problem had an additional complica-
-tion. Wakefield wrote:

There is no so pressing want for the
whole undertaking as the nomination
of the principal clergy. Till that
shall be done, sincerely religious
people of all shades will be afraid
of the predominance of some strong
party spirit in the settlement adverse
to their own theological views. My
brother meets this fear everywhere, and
finds it a most serious obstacle to
the enlistment of good colonists.³²

A solution seemed to be in the offing when Wynter
suggested the Reverend W Maddock, and Lyttelton and
the ecclesiastical sub-committee concurred in this
choice. Maddock was agreeable, the appointment was
announced with relief, but disaster struck a month
later when he withdrew. A depressed Wakefield wrote:

Two good men declining the offer
must prove - a heavy blow and great

30 Go to Ad, 27 Sept. 1849: Godley-Adderley Letters,
p. 131.

31 Glen, "Canterbury Association", p. 103

32 Wa to McGeachy, 27 Feb 1850, Founders, p. 221.

discouragement - Maddock's name as the intended Bishop has spread through the religious world. His refusal of a notorious offer casts a slur on the appointment and the settlement... Add to this the running down of the entire enterprise by the Low Church party, the common belief that it a "Puseyite affair", and the ill-will, not inactive, of Selwyn's friends - together with the goring of each other by Gorham and Phillpots: put all these things together, and you will see that the affair is, ecclesiastically, in a desperate mess. Nothing can put it right in time, but relief from the heavy burthen of Maddock's deliberate refusal. That will be attributed to his having found out that it is "a Puseyite affair".³³

On 17 April the Association had to endure the humiliation of a public meeting without a bishop, which did not help its claim to be a distinctly church project. With the departure of the first batch of colonists imminent, the inability of the Association to convincingly answer the accusations of colonial puseyism was making it difficult to sell land, raise loans, or enlist colonists. Moreover the evangelicals amongst the intending colonists were thinking twice about the whole venture. A spate of defections in June caused Wakefield to single out one as an example:

the renegade has turned preacher against Canterbury ... You won him, or rather his wife, but when she

³³ Wa to Wyn, 9 April 1850, Founders, p. 253.

had completely overcome his Low-Church scruples, his own family made a dead set at him, and frightened him with Papish bugaboos, till at last he bolted quite out of sight. No loss, you'll say. Truly: but, on the other hand, his defection has proved very mischievous, because his kith and kin abuse us in order to excuse him.³⁴

Moreover the Association was coming under increasing pressure from the remaining colonists on the bishopric question as the following memorandum in Wakefield's correspondence reveals:

A representation from the Colonists to the Committee, setting forth the ill effects of uncertainty as to the character and opinions of the Bishop. This in some detail, with a statement of the facts concerning the manner in which the undertaking is maligned by several parties in the Church, each of which seems to expect that the Bishop and clergy of the settlement will be men holding views antagonistic to their own. It is a serious impediment, which at one time there appeared to be only one means of removing; that is, by the announcement of the Bishop by name. The disappointment of Mr Wynter's wish to be the Bishop prevents this just now: but it has occurred to the Colonists that another means might be employed as effectually. This is a public assurance by the

34 Wa to Go, 22 June 1850, Founders, pp 278-279.

Association that in recommending a gentleman to the notice of the Primate and her Majesty's government they will use their best endeavours to select one who shall be pleasing to the First Body of Colonists, and in possession of their confidence and respect.³⁵

It was this pressure that pushed the Association into making the rash choice of the Reverend Thomas Jackson as the bishop-elect of Canterbury.

As the date for the sailing of the first colonists drew closer, the Association began a determined counter attack on its critics, ably assisted by that pro-colonising organ, The New Zealand Journal:

Some of the best and most prominent men of both parties in the church have united to further this scheme ... The Archbishop of Dublin and the Bishop of Exeter, Lord Lyttelton and Lord Ashley, Archdeacon Hare and Dr Hook, men who, although they are united in one common bond of church union, are still divergent in matters of doctrine to a degree which would seem, at first sight, to preclude any possibility of joint agency, are found working side by side in the undertaking. Funds, patronage, good-will, a desire to sink party feeling in the endeavour to promote the common good are all visible.³⁶

35 Wa to Rintoul, 14 April 1850, Founders, p. 259.

36 The New Zealand Journal, 7 Sept 1850, p. 216.

On its own behalf the Association published a pamphlet entitled Two Unfounded Opinions about the Canterbury Colony. In answer to the accusation that it was:

a regular Puseyite affair

it pointed to the prominent evangelicals who belonged to the Association. In reply to the counter-claim that:

in all Jesuitical affairs there are
blinds and tools

it pointed out that the superior class of settlers the Association was depending upon to make a success of the project would not emigrate without carefully considering this claim and rejecting it. The anonymous author declared that both evangelical and tractarian extremists would be disappointed to discover that the Association was:

bent on repelling, all party spirit,
whether of "High Church", "Low Church",
or "Dry Church".

In answer to the claim that it was going to be:

a priest-ridden colony

the author declared that the church element in the scheme was a means to the end of making it a superior colony attractive to the best kind of Englishman. The Church would have no connection with the state, no political power and would only possess:

that moral influence which ministers
of all denominations will be equally
free to acquire by the moral means
of persuasion and example.

The first ships duly departed and the Association seemed to be out of trouble.

But as the first ships sailed away, the Papal aggression burst upon England. Godley's friends wrote him a series of gloomy letters lamenting the "No Popery" scare, the conversion to Rome of mutual friends, and fears of an episcopal secession from the

Church of England:

It is my only consolation that the Church of England is putting forth vigorous scions in foreign lands even when the time of her glory as far as human eyes can judge is departing from her.³⁷

The colonial newspapers joined the national outcry and The Australian and New Zealand Gazette launched a series of slashing attacks on Bishop Selwyn for his Puseyite leanings. It went on to denounce tractarianism's:

staunch advocates... the very men who have been the most distinguished in the promotion of their creed in the colonies;- the Wilberforces, the Coleridges and the subordinates of whom they are the leaders.³⁸

At first Wakefield was confident that the Association could ride out the storm. He had partially overcome the problem of recruiting suitable principal clergy for the colony and speaking of the Reverend Nugent Wade, at that time the prospective warden of College House, he declared:

He is not quite free from party reputation; but the objection, great as it is for the particular office, has been overcome in my mind by his most winning mind and manner; and I rely somewhat, on the present destruction, or destruction for the present, of the ultra Militarian party by the monstrous folly of Dr Wiseman and Pio Nono, and the weakmindedness of those of our clergy who fly to Rome because they are uncomfortable, or, if they stay, parade their belief in the

substantial importance of vestments
and attitudes.

He triumphantly crowed:

Bowler has made a report on the
whole management of the eight
ships... It will astonish many
of our Detractors, by showing that
"a lot of Young Englanders, Parsons,
Puseyites" and so forth, can do a
very complicated and difficult piece
of real city business, not only
better and cheaper, but far better
and cheaper, than it has ever been
done before.³⁹

But shortly afterwards Wakefield was alarmed by
Sewell's report that it was extremely likely that
parliament, under pressure from Lord Ashley, was
contemplating a reform of the Prayer Book. The effect
of this would be to split the Association between a
parliamentary church party made up of evangelicals and
liberals who supported the new Prayer Book and a
secessionist, or free church party made up of high church
-men and tractarians who supported the old Prayer Book.
Sewell's proposed solution was to place Canterbury under
the jurisdiction of Bishop Selwyn who would be sure to
reject the new Prayer Book, thus satisfying the high
churchmen; while the low churchmen could not object to
such a legal course of action. Wakefield opposed
this on the grounds that since the Association charter
sought to promote:

the Church of England as by law
established

Sewell's solution would be immediately denounced
by the laity as an evasion of the obligation of law.
Wakefield's report of his conversation with Sewell
continued:

that one of the means by which
party strife had hitherto been

those who object to Bishop Selwyn's High opinions, that he is not to be the Bishop of the Settlement; that a full submission to him now, on the supposition that Mr Jackson would certainly (as he certainly would) go with the Church of the loaves and fishes, and that a Selwyn-appointed Bishop suffragan should be appointed instead, would raise amongst us the very division it is so desirable to avert; that my hope is that we may get along, as we have done hitherto in matters of religious opinion, by carefully avoiding any appointment distasteful to the bulk of the Laity who emigrate (nine-tenths of whom, at least, are even afraid of High Church tendencies) and by also avoiding appointments and deeds so far of a party character as to displease even the Highest Churchman in the Association; that to do all this requires a most skillful steering of the ship, more especially now when the country is torn by a feud growing out of the R. C. proceedings.⁴⁰

Although this crisis did not eventuate, the next month brought a more serious one. At a colonists' meeting at the Adelphi, Wynne told Wakefield that John Simeon, brother to Charles Simeon an Association member, was on the verge of going over to Rome.

40 Wa to Go, 23 Jan 1851: Canterbury Papers - Letters from E. G. Wakefield to J. R. Godley, Vol. 1, 1815- July 1851

Wakefield asked Wynter to appeal to Simeon's sense of honour and postpone any dramatic action till after the departure of the main body of colonists in that year. Wynter approached Simeon and later told Wakefield that probably nothing would eventuate for quite some time. However Wakefield decided to take no chances and brought forward the departure date of the main expedition by a month. The precaution was certainly justified for in May he wrote to Godley:

I shall not say much about John Simeon's perversion to Rome. The fact has only realised my anticipations. It is, as I also anticipated, a heavy blow to Canterbury. But if it have the effect of making the Committee take good care to avoid the imputation of Tractarianism on the road to Romanism - as the laity of England, 99 to 100, now think Tractarianism to be - the shock of the blow will not last long. At present there can be no doubt that whatever indisposition there was (and it was very considerable and widespread) to embark for Canterbury on account of its supposed Puseyism, has been much increased for the present by Simeon's passage from Tractarianism to Romanism. If you think that I dwell over much on this subject, I would remind you that thus far, so far as we are aware, out of the 1800 people who have sailed for Canterbury, not one is a person of very High-Church opinions;⁴¹ it is a fact (let those

41 An incorrect statement as chapter 3 will show

account for it who can), that the colonizing public is almost entirely anti-Tractarian. Put this and that together and you will see the real importance of the subject in its bearing on all our operations.⁴²

Another difficulty was that Jackson was returning home soon to face the wrath of the Association over his financial bunglings. It was highly likely that he would think attack the best means of defence, side with Lord Ashley and the evangelicals, exploit the public furore over the Papal aggression and John Simeon's defection to Rome, and discredit the Association as a Romanising body. In the event, Jackson was dealt with firmly before being allowed to make too much trouble. But the Canterbury Association, desperate to raise loans to finance road building, excused its poor financial situation on the grounds:

that the distracted state of the Church, nearly squeezed to death between Phillpotts and Ashley, puts subscriptions of any amount out of the question.⁴³

After this, the ecclesiastical crises of the Association abated as peace slowly returned to the church. It had been a close call.

So we come to an end of this survey of the relationship between the Oxford movement and the Canterbury Association. In reviewing the evidence we must conclude that there was substantial injection of tractarian ideology into the Canterbury project through the "political Puseyism" of Godley and the similar ideals of Lord John Manner's Young England party. The tractarians were not interested in the Canterbury settle-

42 Wa to Go, 6 May 1851: Canterbury Papers - Letters from E. G. Wakefield to J. R. Godley, Vol.1. 1815-July, 1851.

43 Wa to Go, Ibid

-ment because they saw it as a bolt hole for catholic anglicanism from its protestant persecutors, though they may have been interested in the possibility of setting up a non-established church. Deeply concerned about the revival of Convocation and dubious of the value of the Royal Supremacy they might have thought it possible to create a free episcopal church in New Zealand. What is certain is that the tractarians involved themselves with the Canterbury Association because of the social and political implications of their churchmanship. Their social vision was based on a romantic, conservative protest against democracy and industrialism. They wished to alleviate social distress and postpone a social cataclysm in Britain by emigration, and create and pious and just, hierachical society in Canterbury. They also wished to create a powerful and glorious branch of the Church of England at a time when the Mother Church seemed to be breaking up. It would be fair to say that Godley and his fellow tractarians became involved in the Canterbury Association because of their tractarian ideology. However, when they got down to business their religious and social vision faded, as they faced the more practical problems of actually getting the project off the ground. Unfortunately we do not know who made up "the Coleridge party" or if they wanted Bishop Selwyn for Canterbury because they thought him a fellow tractarian or just a good bishop.

The evangelicals seem to have been more concerned with sending missionaries overseas rather than a complete dioceson organisation. They feared church colonization because it might threaten the dominance of the CMS in many missionary areas, exercise a bad social influence on the natives under the care of evangelical missionaries, and lead to the ousting of evangelicals in the mission field by tractarian clergy. Apart from the concern of John Hutt and some of the evangelically

minded colonists about the possibility of Bishop Selwyn becoming Bishop of Canterbury, the evangelicals do not appear to have had much influence on the decisions of the Association. Hutt was their only man on the Management Committee.

No other party in the Church of England seems to have had the ideals or the energy to sponsor such a thoroughly ecclesiastical colonial venture. Without Godleys "political Puseyism" Wakefield's plan of colonization would only have been an interesting idea. In this sense tractarianism can be said to have given practical substance to the Canterbury project.

The Association's membership was aristocratic, conservative and anglican. It contained a relatively small but powerful group of tractarians and their sympathisers, with a small but influential representation on the Management Committee. Most of the members of the Management Committee were moderate or non-party churchmen.

The Association seems to have been relatively free from internal party strife and, with one or two exceptions, its members stuck to the practicalities of the business in hand. Members did their feuding outside the Association and these external feuds had quite an impact on the Association's affairs.⁴⁴ However, despite the care of its founders, the Association was unfairly labelled a Puseyite affair by low church propagandists from its inception, and the unfortunate label stuck. The Church of England was in a distracted state over the Gorham judgement and the Papal aggression, and both the British public and the colonising public seem to have been largely unsympathetic to tractarianism. The Canterbury project began just at the moment when the Church of England was being strained to the limits of its toleration. The "Puseyite label" problem became acute in 1850-1 and revealed itself in three specific crises: the bishopric question, the Papal aggression and John Simeon's

defection to Rome. The Association found it difficult to convince prejudiced public opinion that it was not a "regular Puseyite affair". This public distrust resulted in the Association's difficulties in selling land, enlisting colonists, raising loans and finding a suitable bishop. These problems became particularly acute in 1851. However, the Association gained its central objective of despatching two main expeditions of colonists to Canterbury in 1850 and 1851. This achievement, coupled with the gradual return of peace to the church, had defused the problem by 1852.

CHAPTER 111

EARLY CANTERBURY ANGLICANISM

At the public breakfast for the main expedition of Canterbury colonists in July 1850 the Reverend William Sewell made a speech:

He prayed that the spirit of party and controversy might be excluded; that the colonists would have nothing to do with the controversies of the day, but cling to their prayer books and their bishops, for then he was sure they would succeed ... It would be the duty of the bishop to point out the dangers of covetousness and of faction, and to show where there true ambition should be placed; there was no power to keep them together except that of their bishop and their church, which would bind them by a golden chain and assist them in developing a sound and healthy freedom.¹

In constant danger of becoming embroiled in ecclesiastical controversy itself, the Canterbury Association hoped that disputes over churchmanship would be absent in the new colony. Certainly Wakefield thought that no such problem should arise for he believed that none of the 1800 colonists who had departed for Canterbury by 1851 were "of very High Church opinions". We know little

1 C A Times, 31 July, 1850.

about the churchmanship of the first colonists, but we do know that among them was Benjamin Mountfort, the architect, who became the leading anglo catholic layman of the diocese. In October 1877 he sent a memorial protesting against the Kaiapoi judgement to Bishop Harper, and it is certain that three of his co-signatories came out in the first two main expeditions.² Some of the colonists were evangelicals, some were wesleyans, a few were Presbyterians; but most were ordinary anglican laity untouched by the party strife in the Church of England.

What kind of anglican church would they find in New Zealand and what was the churchmanship of its most dominant personality, Bishop Selwyn? The North Island had been evangelised by CMS clergy and catechists who had had considerable success amongst the Maoris. Theirs was an austere religion, devoid of fast day or feast, with infrequent celebrations of the holy communion, and a large emphasis on the bible and the Prayer Book. In competition with them were wesleyan and roman catholic missionaries. Church life had been established in the large european communities in Nelson, Wellington and Auckland. Of the small number of europeans in Canterbury most were presbyterians, with a small roman catholic community at Akaroa, and a handful of anglicans.

From his headquarters at St Johns College, Auckland, Bishop Selwyn presided over this confused patchwork of a missionary diocese. A man of considerable ability and forceful, charming personality he

2 The memorialists were the most active anglo catholic laity in the diocese. The ones referred to are: B. W. Mountfort, Charlotte Jane; Francis Taylor, Randolf; Margaret Taylor, Midlothian; Alexander Anderson, Steadfast;

succeeded in captivating even the suspicious Godley. In a very real sense he set the tone for New Zealand churchmanship. One of his most decisive acts was to put a stop to the informal intercommunion arrangements which had sprung up between the anglican and wesleyan missionaries. Declaring the wesleyans to be schismatics, he forbade anglican converts to enter their places of worship on pain of excommunication. The bad feeling that resulted from this led to the first accusations of Puseyism against Selwyn and the charge stuck. From then his most innocent actions were closely examined for their bearing on his churchmanship. Whether it was installing a credence table in a church at Taranaki or putting candlesticks on the altar at St Johns, rumours and speculations gained a wide currency in the parochial colonial communities of the time.

One settler recalled:

When I arrived in the colony I found that Bishop Selwyn had been by acclamation voted a Puseyite. Not having much belief in popular acclamation I was pertinacious in asking why? "What is Puseyism?" said I - "Could not exactly say" - "Have you read the ninety tracts?" - "No" - "Then why do you call Bishop Selwyn a Puseyite?" - "Well; he has got a cross on his tent!" But even I lapsed into error. The Bishop had a little bald spot on the top of his head, so round and so sharply defined that I mistook it for an embryo tonsure.³

The charge of Puseyism was widely believed in Britain, particularly because of the critical reports

3 Carleton, Life of Henry Williams, ii, 55, Quoted in J. Miller, Early Victorian New Zealand, p. 186.

of a jumpy colonial press. "We are grieved to hear", observed the Australian and New Zealand Gazette:

from sources the accuracy of which is indisputable, that in New Zealand the practices of the head of the church there savour more of Rome than of Canterbury... It is stated to us that at the seat of the episcopacy, "Romish" mummeries are in vogue, feasts and fasts kept, confession practiced, and a system of monkery established, even to the compelling the clergy and their wives to "dine in hall" - in "refectory" we, perhaps, ought to have said. We are sorry to see a man of Dr Selwyn's energetic mind engaged in such puerilities.⁴

Were the charges true? What were Selwyn's opinions?:

You are entitled to receive this statement of my feelings, that you may know how far I sympathise with the religious movement of which Oxford was the centre, and at what point I stop ... While it seemed that the one object of all their endeavours was to develop in all its fullness the actual system of the anglican church, neither adding aught to it, nor taking aught away from it; but purifying its corruptions, calling forth its latent energies, encouraging its priesthood to higher aims, and to

4 ANZ Gazette, 30 Nov 1850, p. 61.

a holier and more self-denying life...
 - in one word, while they seemed to
 teach us to do in our own system
 and ritual what the apostles did
 in their days, and what our own
 church still prescribes; I felt that
 I could not disobey their calling,
 because it was not theirs, but the
 voice of my Holy Mother whom I had
 sworn to obey, and the example of
 the apostles which it was my heart's
 desire to follow. But when a change
 came upon the spirit of their teaching,
 and it seemed as if our own Church was
 not good enough to retain their
 allegiance; when, instead of the unity
 for which we had prayed, we seemed
 to be on the verge of a frightful
 schism; then indeed I shrunk back,
 as if a voice had spoken within me:
 Not one step further; for I love
 my Church in which I was born to
 God, and by his help I will love
 her to the end.⁵

Selwyn had left for New Zealand in 1842 and so had
 only been influenced by the triumphant first phase of
 tractarianism. He was not in England during its defeat
 at Oxford and its later development into ritualism.
 Yet though influenced by the Oxford movement he was
 no tractarian for he had taken part in the consecration
 of the Bishop of Jerusalem. He had only a hazy
 conception of where the Oxford movement was going, and
 could be patron of the camden society and take its

5 H. W. Tucker, Life of Bishop Selwyn, Vol 1,
 pp. 240-241.

plans and designs for colonial churches to New Zealand without anticipating the future development in ritual and ecclesiastical architecture which was the hallmark of that society. He seems to have regarded tractarianism as a rejuvenated form of the old fashioned high church movement. Thus he could talk about "Our Anglo Catholic Church" while at the same time presiding over a predominantly low church clergy. But what he was really interested in was the revival and renewal of Convocation, Synods of bishops, the Cathedral system, and Diocesan organisation, all of which seemed to be effectively functioning in the roman catholic church. He shared the tractarians horror of erastianism and wanted to see the Church of England shake itself free of state control. And this was why New Zealand was so important to him, for it seemed to offer the chance of a fresh start:

My desire is, in this country,
so far as God may give me light
and strength, to try what the
actual system of the Church of
England can do, when disencumbered
from its earthly load of seats in
Parliament, Erastian compromises,
corruption of patronage, confusion
of orders, synodless bishops, and
an unorganized clergy.⁶

It has been argued⁷ that colonial bishops needed tractarianism in order to assert a true episcopal role because they lacked the security of social and political power enjoyed by their English counterparts. It would seem that Selwyn was selective in his adoption of

6 H. W. Tucker, Life of Bishop Selwyn, Vol 1, p.200.

7 A. P. Cooper, "The Oxford Movement and Australia".

tractarian principles and that his missionary experience enhanced his appreciation of the tractarian view of the episcopal role. In a letter to Bishop Samuel Wilberforce of Oxford Selwyn declared that:

the time is past when there was truth in the saying, that the pomp of bishops conciliated the respect of the people ... Think ... whether the time be not come to Ecclesiasticize our order, to drop the bad imitation of the aristocracy, and to appear in a character peculiarly and strikingly our own.⁸

Selwyn was very much influenced by the tractarians, (some of his missionary enthusiasm had been caught from Manning) but he was not a party man. Like the members of the Canterbury Association who were interested in Canterbury as a church settlement he wanted a New Zealand church enshrining tractarian objectives without using tractarian means or men.

The clergy the Canterbury Association sent out do not seem to have been well chosen for a colonial life and, by and large, were neither active nor energetic in the performance of their duties. Complaints against them came early and one of the most damaging criticisms came from FitzGerald:

Besides, I maintain the clergy have frequently if not generally done more harm than good on board. Three were habitual and beastly drunkards. Complaints were made privately against others for non attention. It is indeed manifest that the class

8 Sel to Wilb, 20 Dec 1849, Bodleian Library, Oxford, Ms Wilberforce, C. 10 ff. 20-21. Quoted in Cooper's "The Oxford Movement and Australia",

of clergymen who would take a work of that kind, a temporary employment, to roam over the world is a bad one - the worst chaps. (Illegible)
 Again I say the Aforementioned did not get the work done when they could for nothing. Sometimes the chaplain has been appointed to a ship in which a clergyman was a passenger.⁹

Worse was to follow, for when the ships chaplains arrived at Lyttelton they found that there were too many clergy for a small colonial community and that the Association did not have sufficient money to pay for the schoolteachers and clergy it had taken on. An alarmed Godley pointed out in early 1851 that there were 7 clergymen for a population of 2,000 people and at least another 6 clergy were expected in June. He went on to predict correctly the eventual outcome of this situation:

the Clerical establishment being enormously disproportioned to the wants of the people, the greater number of the clergy will necessarily be sinecurists and must either become altogether secularized by living and supporting themselves as ordinary settlers, or receive clerical incomes which they cannot earn by real work.

He blamed the Association for selecting clergy of independent means who would naturally become land-owners:

⁹ FitzGerald to Selfe, 6 Aug 1852: Selfe Papers

men who are likely, in fact to
be primarily settlers and
landowners, and but secondarily
priests.¹⁰

Thus with few churches, few stipends, and no bishop the Canterbury clergy became discontented and cantankerous, plaguing the Association with requests for money, churches, a bishop, and even alleging that they had been persuaded to come out under false pretences. All in all, they do not seem to have been of that superior class of self sacrificing priests that the tractarian revival was producing to work under the most difficult of conditions as slum pastors in the great industrial cities of England.

The Reverend C. Alabaster and the Reverend W. W. Willock were said by some to be high churchmen but I have been unable to find any hint of this. Henry Sewell found the Reverend W. B. Dudley to be "rather extreme in his views", unpopular with many for his treatment of tenants, strictly adhering to the fasts and festivals of the Prayer Book, punctilious in the holding of a daily service, and strong against dissent. Yet Dudley's later career gives no hint of a taste for things "High". Sewell found the standard of clerical ministrations better and the laity more faithful in Canterbury than in Wellington where shortened services in only two churches attracted less than 200 churchgoers out of a population of 3,000 people. Canterbury had some devoted clergy but the reputation of the church was being tarnished by the scandalous behaviour of the Reverend Joseph Twigger. A man of considerable capital, Twigger came out on the Cornwall in 1851 and took up a life of land ownership and hard drinking. On a dark night in 1855 he left the White Hart Hotel,

10 Go to Lyt, 10 June 1851: Canterbury Papers,
Godley Letters.

having consumed his usual twenty nips, fell into the Avon, and drowned.

The anglican church in Canterbury was facing severe problems. Some of them stemmed from the Association's land policy. Poor land sales coupled with a drought in New South Wales and Victoria obliged Godley to relax the restrictions which favoured an agricultural economic base for Canterbury and allow in Australian pastoralists. By 1853 approximately one million acres had been taken up by large sheep runs and the pilgrims had been joined by Australian squatters, who had been allowed in without any kind of religious test. Moreover, the Secretary of State had declared that he would not allow exclusive anglicanism in Canterbury. The poor land sales and cheap pasturage rights had left the anglican church with little money to finance church building or ecclesiastical endowments. The influx of Australian pastoralists meant that there were quite a few unselected colonists of all shades of religious opinions. The anglican church was in a particularly weak position to cope with this new challenge of lost advantages since the early resignation of Bishop-designate Jackson left its highly centralised authority structure without episcopal direction. The situation was further complicated by the Association's reluctance to grant the colonists full control over their own ecclesiastical affairs. This vacuum in leadership led to this situation:

It must be said that the picture presented by the Church in Canterbury at the beginning of the year 1857, is not a cheerful one. A state of apathy and inertness everywhere appear. Clergy and laity alike show little power of initiative, and no missionary zeal.¹¹

11 H. T. Purchas, Bishop Harper and the Canterbury Settlement, p. 72.

By contrast, the non conformists with their grass roots organisation and localised authority structure had an inherent advantage in a frontier society. Aided by the sudden influx of co-religionists from Australia the non conformists exhibited considerable initiative and by the mid 1850's two wesleyan chapels and a presbyterian church had been built. The anglican church would continue to flounder until an effective bishop was sent out. Summing up the problems of the day a perceptive (though not unbiased) observer stated:

In short owing to causes not very hard to seek the Church of England seems less popular, though it may have more adherents than in the other provinces of New Zealand where it took its chances among all comers. Complaints were not few of the hardship of having to pay twice over for Church ministrations, once in the price of land and now in voluntary subscriptions for Cathedrals, schools, maintenance of Clergy, and so forth, from which the purchasers of three pound an acre land flattered themselves they had escaped for the rest of their natural lives. The individual clergy, also with one or two exceptions are perhaps not considered very bright and shining examples of the efficacy of apostolic descent to qualify for the ecclesiastical leadership of the model Church colony of the nineteenth century.¹²

In 1857 Bishop Harper arrived and thereafter the situation rapidly improved. A close friend of Selwyn's,

12 Fox to Godley, 31 Dec 1858: Ms Canterbury Museum

he became a tutor at Eton and while there was ordained to the anglican ministry. At first he was a clergyman of relatively low church views. However, in the late 1830s he took a deep interest in the Oxford movement and changed his theological outlook to the point where he completely adopted the tractarian emphasis on baptismal regeneration and sought to deepen his inner life through a disciplined spirituality on the tractarian pattern. In 1840 he became the vicar of the country parish of Mortimer and distinguished himself as an exemplary parish priest. The innovations he introduced suggest that he was sensitive to the reforms of the Oxford movement without being a wholehearted supporter of tractarianism. Communion was monthly, and there was a service on saints' days at 11a.m. Great care was taken over the preparation of candidates for Confirmation. The rood loft and gallery was removed, along with the choir and brass band, to make way for a restored chancel which accommodated a surpliced choir and barrel organ. He was a moderate churchman who disliked theological liberalism and was sympathetic to the earlier phase of anglo catholicism.¹³ But there is one factor in Bishop Harper's family background which has so far escaped the notice of historians. His brother George was also ordained an anglican priest but later changed his allegiance to become a roman catholic priest. Father George Harper died in 1862 ministering to plague victims in Lancashire. Perhaps his brother catholic priest tinged Bishop Harper's sympathy for the Oxford movement with suspicion when later developments seemed to indicate a tractarianism on the way to romanism.

The considerable ability of the man was revealed in the next few years in that by the early 1860s he had put the affairs of the Christchurch diocese on a sound footing.

13 i.e. non-ritualistic tractarianism

The three basic problems which Bishop Harper diagnosed were, an inadequate income for clerical stipends and for diocesan administration, too few churches, and a slack clergy. The first problem was resolved by the bishop persuading church people to accept the innovation of paying clerical stipends and diocesan quotas by means of a monthly collection. The second by persuading the laity to sponsor a church building programme and to lobby the Provincial Government for financial assistance. The third was the most difficult problem and the bishop's diaries provide ample evidence that his clergy were not the stuff of which enthusiastic self-sacrificing tractarian priests were made. The bishop's task was to get the clergy off their farms, persuade them to do more than hold two services a Sunday and do a little pastoral work in their immediate locality. The clergy would have to be galvanized into extending their pastoral ministrations to the hitherto neglected sheep runs on the Canterbury plains and to beginning missionary work amongst the Maori communities. H. T. Purchas sums up the bishop's difficult task in these words:

Very few of the first clergy of the settlement ~~ex~~caped reproof and even censure from their new diocesan. In some cases he went to the length of withdrawing their licenses altogether - sometimes restoring them upon promises of amendment. But all this exercise of discipline was carried out with great tact, and was known to few beyond the persons immediately affected. Sometimes a clergyman was deprived of a pastoral charge under the guise of preferment to another position, which brought

perhaps greater dignity, but fewer opportunities of helping-or hindering- the real work of ministering to souls. The grounds upon which the bishop acted were generally those of negligence and inactivity.¹⁴

Nor was he slow in proclaiming his views on changes in worship and ceremonial. Better informed than most about developments in the English Church, he laid down guidelines about what was permissible in his diocese. In his presidential address to the synod of 1870, he declared that alterations in the forms of church services should be governed by the advice of the Prayer Book, which recommended that the church be neither too easy nor too stiff in authorising innovations in services. He went on to suggest tentatively the introduction of evening communion services, a practice abhorrent to fasting anglo catholics. The bishop was a moderate who disapproved of any extremist, whether bishop or parish priest, who forced his own personal preferences on his congregation. But he was prepared to allow a certain latitude in the way services were conducted, and would allow special services if the congregation completely approved of them and if the clergyman had sought the bishop's permission. In his opening address to the 1875 synod, he opposed any alteration in the services and formularies of the Prayer Book, particularly as they related to ceremonial usages in worship, on the grounds that any revision would only add to the divisions with the church. However a diversity of usages ought to be allowed within different provinces of the anglican communion¹⁵ and he went on to define more

14 H. T. Purchas, Bishop Harper and the Canterbury Settlement, p. 83.

15 Presumably this meant that each country ought to be allowed a certain latitude in its liturgical forms.

strictly what was permissible in his diocese. He pointed out that the Prayer Book demanded only a minimal conformity in ceremonial usages, prohibiting only usages which might deny or distort the church's doctrine or teach false doctrine. Congregations were allowed a considerable liberty in the way they interpreted its ambiguous and brief formularies. Some customs, such as the ascription of glory to God before the reading of the Gospel, bowing at the name of Jesus, facing east for the creeds, and the position of the clergyman during various acts of worship, were neither recommended nor denied by the formularies, but had received a certain sanction from long continued use. Their introduction did not involve any question of doctrinal change or obedience or disobedience to authority but was rather a question of whether it would edify a congregation or divide it. Referring to the Phillimore decision in the Court of Arches, 1868,¹⁶ the bishop declared that he had the authority to allow a pluralism in ceremonial usage in which a clergyman with the support of the majority of his vestry could obtain permission for certain ceremonial innovations, which other parishes did not have. The bishop's overriding concern was to maintain unity and keep the peace. The one thing he would not tolerate was novelties in worship being forced on unwilling congregations.

Two points should be made here. Even before its first appearance in Christchurch, anglo catholicism had encouraged the growth of one of its distinctive contributions to nineteenth century church life, congregation-

16 "any ceremony which is subsidiary to what is ordered and in accordance with primitive and catholic use, and not necessarily connected with novelties, which were rejected at the Reformation is lawful; but the doing or the use of ceremony must be governed by the discretion of some person in authority". CN, Nov 1875, p.6.

alism in worship. Fear of its eventual arrival in the diocese had created the possibility of each local anglican church becoming independent and autonomous in its choice of style of worship. It could only be a matter of time before some local anglican parishes took advantage of Bishop Harper's guidelines for liturgical changes and moved towards a more catholic type of worship. The second point is that because of the generally low church character of the diocese Bishop Harper's guidelines would only secure peace for the church if an innovating anglo catholic priest was prepared to move slowly and bring all his people with him.

In Canterbury, as in many other nineteenth century european colonies, the denominational patterns of the old world were faithfully reproduced. This was particularly true of the Canterbury anglicans who brought with them the traditional party positions within their own denomination. Throughout the 1860s a small but highly articulate body of anglo catholic laity were coming into existence in the diocese of Christchurch. They were led by one or two clergy who, though distinctly moderate and timid by British standards, seemed daringly "High" to their colonial contemporaries. Nor were the anglo catholics the only party to develop in strength. The anglican settlers in this period seem to have been generally low church by today's standards but there was more diversity than has hitherto been assumed. This is illustrated by the Church News report of the consecration of St Marys, Timaru, in 1871:

A few minutes after 11 o'clock, a procession was formed headed by a dozen choir boys; they certainly presented a motley appearance, clothes of all colours and shapes, white

flannel caps, straw hats and billycocks. It would very much have added to solemnity of the service if surplices had been provided for the choir. And then, the clergy, one naturally asks why they cannot adopt some uniform style of dress - short surplices to the knees, and long surplices trailing to the ground, surplices with a multitude of plaits, and surplices plain on the shoulders, correct-looking cassocks, and grey trousers and muddy boots, two college caps, a biretta, a bell-topper, and felt hats of many shapes. The High, Low and Broad Church seem to have each their (sic) distinctive style of dress, but if all things were done decently and in order such incongruities would not be seen.¹⁷

The most prominent of the "High" clergy was a mission priest, the Reverend Henry Cooper. Originally from Ireland, his ministry to the people of Canterbury extended to many of the remote areas where no parochial organisation was established.¹⁸ His tractarian theological views were most untypical of Irish protestant clergy though he had the Irish love of controversy and strong opinions. In May 1872 he went to a public meeting intending to deliver a lecture on "Ritualism". It was to be a reply to the attacks made on the founders of the Oxford movement during a recent address delivered by a presbyterian minister. Before he was a quarter

17 CN, Nov 1871, p. 19. Birettas seem to have been characteristic of clerical eccentricity rather than the party badge they later became.

18 "his sphere of work was the district between the Rakaia and Rangitata rivers, the Mackenzie Country, the Peninsula and a few districts in Canterbury". S. Parr, Canterbury Pilgrimage, p. 86.

of the way through his lecture an over-wrought Presbyterian minister, the Reverend McGowan, rose to his feet and made such a commotion that the chairman stopped the lecture. Never a man to give up easily, Henry Cooper then published his lecture in The Press and Church News. Although he said that he was:

not about to speak in favour or
defence of what has been called
the Tractarian movement

he went on to deliver a lengthy and emotional defence of John Keble and Dr E. B. Pusey. Nor could there be any doubt where Coopers doctrinal sympathies lay:

In the present day there is a great
deal of clap-trap talked about,
Ritualism and many other isms, but
the safeguard of Churchmen is the
firm belief in the truth and office
of the English Church, in the Divine
Nature of her Episcopate, in the
Apostolical Succession of her
Priesthood, and in the abiding
presence of her blessed Lord in
the Holy Sacrament.

Such a belief will be the best
safeguard against Popery on the
one hand and Dissent on the other,
holding fast to these truths, I say:-

"God save the Church! be this our cry,
Both when we live, and when we die;
For rave her foemen as they will,

The Church is England's glory still".¹⁹

For England in the 1870's these were comparatively unremarkable ideas but in Canterbury this was fighting talk.

In 1872 Cooper became locum tenens of Holy Trinity,

¹⁹ CN, May 1871, pp. 7-8

Avonside. In the interregnum before the new vicar arrived, several special Holy Week services were introduced, including the "Three Hours" service on Good Friday. This service is now standard form in many parishes and consists of a series of sermons on the Passion interspersed with hymns and prayers. Once again Cooper was in the news as controversy broke out in Christchurch newspapers over the innovations. The Church News summarised the controversy admirably. After stating that Cooper had taken special morning and afternoon services throughout Holy Week it went on to say:

On Thursday morning, March 28th, a letter appeared in the Press, signed "Anti-Ritualist", denouncing in strong terms the setting up of a shelf beside the communion table, the weekly celebration of the Holy Communion, choral services, and other matters which the personal feeling entertained for the late incumbent had caused to be passed over; and saying that during the week the proceedings had been so extreme as to oblige some of the really Christian people to leave the parish church. A gentleman had told him that across the chancel was hung a black or dark-coloured curtain, intended, he (the gentleman) believed, to represent the veil of the temple, the communion table was perfectly bare, and the prayer-desks were drawn out into the body of the church. "Anti-Ritualist" heard that the veil was to be rent at three o'clock on Good Friday, as a conclusion to a service which was to take up the whole day. "My informant", he says, "was so

scandalized that he declares neither he nor his family will enter the church again". The letter concludes by stating that the services were attended by a large number principally strangers.

... On the Saturday morning a letter appeared in The Press from Mr Henry Slater,²⁰ one of the churchwardens..., containing a full explanation and refutation of all matters alluded to by "Anti-Ritualist". The credence table... was put up during the time, and with the approbation, of Mr Martin, a former incumbent, and there had been one choral service on Christmas Day, when the number of communicants had been greater than on any former occasion. Mr Slater says:- "Of the extreme of ritual, the black curtain which "Anti-Ritualist"... hears is to be rent on Good Friday at three p.m., these are the facts. Some seven or eight months since, the interior of the church was partially painted, but owing to the want of sufficient funds the chancel could not be finished. A few weeks back a parishioner kindly offered to finish the work himself, so that it might be completed on Easter Sunday; but the difficulty arose as to how the work was to be carried on, since Mr Giles intended having daily services during Holy Week. It was suggested that a curtain should be spread across the chancel in order to hide the paint-pots, ladders, etc,

20 Later a co-signatory of the memorial protesting against the Kaiapoi judgement.

necessary in concluding the work. This was done; and there is the sole reason of the temple veil". Mr Slater then mentions by name the gentleman alluded to by "Anti-Ritualist" as having first started the idea of the temple veil, and stated that having called and explained matters, that gentleman had expressed his regret; and the letter concludes as to the number of strangers present at the services as being an assertion simply false. Mr Slater also went to the editor of The Press to demand the name of the anonymous writer, as his letter in the state of vacancy of the cure might do much harm. After communicating with the writer he declined to give his name, but agreed to sign as "Anti-Ritualist" anything in the way of apology that the churchwardens would dictate.²¹

This letter of apology duly appeared in The Press. A low church attack had been premature and based on poor information and had received a public rebuke.

In 1873 Cooper was instituted as vicar of St Peters, Akaroa. His first address to his new parishioners reveals the tractarian ideas he had adopted in his concept of the priesthood. He preferred to speak of himself as "the parish priest", rather than using the traditional titles of "Vicar" or "Parson", because it emphasised his intermediate role between God and man and because it emphasised the sacramental nature of his ministry. He expressed his desire to form a guild of lay people to assist in the work of the church. Obviously this was not supposed to be a cup

21 CN, May 1872, p. 111.

of tea fellowship, for in support of his cherished project he pointed to the sacrificial work of roman catholic and anglo catholic nuns amongst the socially deprived in England. He announced his intention of being loyal to the Prayer Book rubrics with regard to the ritual and ceremonies used in divine worship, and he asked his parishioners to speak with him frankly about any innovations in worship they disapproved of instead of complaining behind his back. Dean Henry Jacobs was present at this gathering and his speech reveals an interesting appreciation of the growing awareness of the laity in liturgical matters:

He was particularly struck by that part of Mr Cooper's address, in which he declared his loyalty to the Prayer-book, and his determination to obey its rules without exceeding them in anything. He would earnestly beg them not to cavil at trifles. He wished to speak plainly. Let them not think that, if a clergyman turned to the east when repeating the creed, he wished to lead them to the Church of Rome, and let them not be alarmed if he wore a red or white stole.²²

Obviously Cooper had adopted some of the milder practices of the ritualists but he was no out and out ritualist. The wearing of coloured stoles was unusual in this part of the world at that time but Cooper did not drastically change the rites and ceremonies to which the people were accustomed. Cooper's speech revealed two characteristically tractarian emphases; on fulfilling the long neglected legal obligations of Prayer book worship, and not going beyond the limits of legality, a scruple with which advanced ritualists often dispensed.

How did all this work out in practice? Cooper wrote articles on ritual in his parish magazine and no critical response was forthcoming. An attempt was made to revive old English sports and social customs traditional on all saints day, such as may pole dancing. We are not told if these eccentric restorations were a success. However, he did succeed in forming his cherished guild which became the subject of an amusing report by The Church News:

The Incumbent has set on foot two guilds, one for male, the other for female, members, who are to be bound together by certain rules of life and work. The guild for females is to be entitled the guild of St Agnes; that for males, the guild of St John of Melanesia. Here we feel bound to enter a protest. With the deepest reverence for the holy memory of Bishop Patterson, or, rather, because we deeply revere it, we object to this act of private canonisation. The precedent might certainly prove an inconvenient one. What if we were called upon to recognise a St Hugh of Ripon, or a St Arthur of Westminster, or perhaps even a St Benjamin of Balliol? The title of Saint would soon become as common, and be held as cheap, as that of Knight of St Michael and St George.²³

Anyone familiar with the workings of a thoroughly anglo catholic parish knows the importance of guilds such as the Confraternity of the Blessed Sacrament or the Guild of the Servers of the Sanctuary. English

23 CN, July 1875, p. 103.

anglo catholics would have regarded Cooper's guilds as being distinctly pretentious and eccentric but we can see in them the prototypes of the guilds which were to be so important in the parochial life of the Church of the Good Shepherd, Phillipstown and St Michaels, Christchurch. Cooper was perhaps Canterbury's first tractarian and proto-ritualist priest. Certainly he was one of its more colourful and eccentric clergy.

Throughout the first half of the 1870s both the anglo catholic and low church parties engaged in controversy in the correspondence columns of The Church News. The issues they contested indicate that the anglo catholics were not trying for a sudden change to an advanced ritual but rather reveal them as trying to change slowly doctrines and ceremonial observances and make themselves more at home in a predominantly low church diocese.

The bishop's commending of evening communions in the 1870 Synod provoked a correspondent styling himself "Catholicus" to write:

considering the source whence the proposal emanated, I feel that a blow has been struck at the catholicity of the Church in New Zealand, and that, if care be not taken, we shall gradually drift into congregationalism, and cease to be part of the Holy Catholic Church.

It was an issue that was bound to raise the ire of anglo catholics for with their insistence on strict fasting before receiving the sacrament evening communions were:

a practice at once uncatholic, unlawful, and tending to the desecration of the highest act of Christian worship.²⁴

Battle was soon joined by the supporters of evening communions, both sides quoting extensively from the patristic fathers to support their case. This is interesting in view of the fact that one of the high church movement's distinctive contributions to anglicanism was its emphasis on patristic scholarship. Particularly noticeable was the strong element of conservatism in anglo catholic arguments:

We are far removed from home influences and the spirit of innovation is ripe among us.²⁵

But it did not require such controversial issues to bring propagandists on both sides into the correspondence columns. In November 1873 an anglo catholic layman complained of the word "Catholic" being used by the public and the press to denote roman catholics, when in fact the word should equally be used of anglo catholics. Furthermore he bitterly denounced the word "Protestant" being used to describe anglicans:

As for the term Protestant, I renounce it altogether.²⁶

In 1874 an irate correspondent from Kaiapoi complained of a jewelled cross displayed at an exhibition of ecclesiastical art as being a waste of money and a source of division in a diocese where different parties managed to work harmoniously together. In the same year "Protestant Layman" complained of articles in The Church News supporting the doctrines of the intercession of saints and the real presence. The Church News, by and large, favoured a moderate dose of "High" doctrines and ceremonial practices. In 1872 the editor was incensed at a correspondent who had asked of the practice of facing east for the creed:

25 CN, Jan 1871, p. 9.

26 CN, Nov 1873, p. 10.

Is not this Rank Popery?

He declared:

surely a plain question can be
asked without at the same time
trying to hurt the feelings of those
who may perhaps think differently
to the enquirer.²⁷

He then went on to quote extensive patristic justifications for the practice objected to.

But the most controversial issue of the day was choral communions. In order to understand what was involved in the controversy it is desirable to know something about the normal worship patterns of the anglican settlers. As we have seen, the church in Canterbury was essentially a pre-Oxford movement church which drew largely on the legacy of eighteenth century anglicanism. In most Canterbury anglican parishes the morning service consisted of matins, the litany, the exhortation, and the holy communion. The service would last from 1½ to 2 hours but length did not worry Victorian clergy who thought it more important to satisfy the legal requirements of the Prayer book that all three forms of service should be used on Sunday. Some churches only had communion monthly and the habit of frequent reception of the sacrament was not as common as it is now. Congregational participation in the liturgy was minimal. Bowing at the name of Jesus, or to the altar, and the ascription of glory to God before the reading of the gospel were optional extras foreign to many. The parson dominated the liturgy with occasional liturgical interruptions from the congregation. Sermons were long. Often the church building was largely devoid of ornament and the church service was devoid of ceremonial. Normal clerical costume consisted of a cassock, a surplice, a black

27 CN, May 1872, p. 110.

scarf and an academic hood, which was worn at all services. The priest read the liturgy from his prayer desk and knelt at the north side of the altar for the eucharistic canon.²⁸ A few hymns were sung at various points in the service. Generally the altar did not have a cross, candlesticks, or an altar cloth on it, and it was generally referred to as "the holy table". Plain bread and not wafer bread was used for the communion, and mixing water with the wine was considered distinctly Popish. Evensong at three or four o'clock in the afternoon was the second service of the day and early morning eucharists were comparatively unknown. All in all, the services were simple, plain, lengthy, and some would say dull. They emphasised the passive hearing of the sermon and the word rather than the active worship of God.

Some of the clergy were aware of the deficiencies of this kind of worship and sought to more actively involve worshippers in choral services. Essentially this was mini-cathedral worship duplicated in the parish setting. Choirs trained to cathedral standards of music were used to sing responsorial parts of the liturgy and to attempt anthems, classical oratorios and other liturgical music. The choirs were surpliced and processions were introduced to provide liturgical entrances and exits. Psalms were chanted, not read, and the clergy intoned parts of the service. Flowers were used to decorate the church on all high festivals. All this was designed to appeal to the aesthetic instincts of the worshippers, though it had the ironic effect of lessening congregational participation since few could match the musical standard of the choir. Choral communions were not ritualist innovations but were supposed to overcome the liturgical deficiencies of the 1860s and appealed to the Victorian desire for

28 This can still be seen in some extreme evangelical churches.

increased decoration and decorum both in the drawing room and the church. But many of the low church party interpreted it as a ritualist innovation and what is now a standard form in many churches of every shade of opinion was then a hotly contested issue.

Bishop Harper was aware of this difficulty. In his address to synod in 1871, he laid down guidelines covering the division or alteration of services:

In all cases there must be the joint approval of Bishop, clergyman, and a majority at least of the vestry. Our congregations will have good cause for complaint if this condition be not steadily adhered to; and it must be understood also as applying to any change in the usual mode of celebrating Divine Service - such, for instance, as the intoning the service or parts of the service. I am far from wishing there should be a rigid uniformity in this respect; I consider it a great advantage that our services should be variously celebrated at different churches, so long as the mode of celebration be such as our Prayer Book allows. We are not all constituted alike, and what may be a hindrance to some in the exercise of their devotional feelings, is to others a real help and refreshment. But no individual, whether Bishop or clergyman, has a right to dictate to a congregation what is most agreeable to himself; still less to introduce changes in the services and the usual mode of performing them, even though some

sanction to such changes may be
given in the rubric.²⁹

The limited scope of these directives meant they only covered a fairly modest amount of liturgical innovation and the bishop had not envisaged what would happen if an out-and-out ritualist came along.

Nor did the directives entirely prevent trouble over the choral communion issue. In July 1873 the Reverend H. J. Edwards was licensed to the parish of St Michaels, Christchurch and it was in his time that choral services and the intoning of the liturgy were introduced. A confused and complicated wrangle broke out between Edwards and his vestry. It is very hard to discover exactly what the argument was about. It seems to have been over how much of the offertory was to be used to pay the vicar's stipend, but mixed up in it were vague accusations of ritualism over the choral services. He was asked to resign in July 1876, and after some opposition on his part, he left in August.³⁰

Dean H. Jacobs was one of the most learned and prominent clergy in the diocese. His views on ritualism are important because his scholarship enabled him to see it as part of a larger change throughout european christianity and because he was to play a crucial part in the Carlyon case. In August 1871 he preached the synod sermon on changes affecting the contemporary church. He pointed to the sudden expansion of anglicanism all over the world and the development of independent self-governing branches of the anglican communion. With this had come the problem of how to maintain unity and peace in a time of rapid

29 CN, Aug 1871, p.2.

30 Personally I am convinced that the accusations of ritualism were completely unfounded and that St Michaels was at that time far from being an anglo catholic parish.

change in which the branch churches were growing away from the English church and finding her formularies irksome, ambiguous and often irrelevant. Jacobs believed that the different branches of the anglican church could find a common approach to their different problems by returning to the reformation principles of guidance by the inspired scriptures and by uncorrupted catholic tradition. This uncorrupted catholic tradition was defined as the universal consent of the church before its division into roman catholicism and eastern orthodoxy.³¹

He defended this appeal to catholic tradition on the grounds that (a) appeal to scripture alone leads to anarchic private judgement, (b) the 39 articles and the reformation divines both appealed to the universal consent of the primitive church, (c) the canon of scripture is a catholic tradition, (d) catholic traditions are enshrined in the structure of anglicanism with its liturgical calendar, doctrine of apostolic succession of bishops and clergy, rite of confirmation, (e) the church has equal authority to that of the scriptures and therefore may appeal to its traditions as being authoritative. Here we have a concept of catholic tradition that an Oxford divine would have approved. But this was no endorsement of the anglo catholic position. Dean Jacobs went on to speak of the threat to anglican superstructures due to:

infinite mischief and confusion having been introduced into our Church at home by the rashness of individuals adopting on their own responsibility, so-called catholic usages, at variance with all the precedents of the Church of England for more than three centuries. What is this, after all, but an unauthorised and wilful following of private judgement?

31 i.e. the creeds and confessions of the four great councils.

He believed that the church should look to its synods for the development of catholic ritual and discipline; rather than to that of a party assuming to declare authoritatively what is catholic.

Dean Jacobs called on the church to:

boldly assume her catholic character. In former times she has been, perhaps, too exclusively Protestant; she had put forward too prominently, in comparison, her negative character. Let her rather endeavour to promote the cause of truth and holiness in the world by teaching affirmatively the faith which the church received from the beginning; by teaching it fully and freely, without being forever haunted by the fear of Romish corruptions and abuses, and by adopting boldly well-considered improvements in her ritual, without being afraid of being assimilated thereby to other Churches.³²

At the same Synod Dean Jacobs was even more explicit on the subject in a paper he delivered to the church meeting entitled Development of Ritual. Defining ritual as "the embodiment of spiritual worship in outward forms" he went on to show how the most ascetic or plain religious devotion uses nature and art to express inward devotion. He pointed out the difficulty in limiting the development of ritual within man's changing circumstances and times. Here he showed a penetrating insight into the motivations behind the increase in ceremonial in Victorian christianity.

Or who would advisedly maintain that the spread of education, the general diffusion of taste, the

32 CN, Aug 1871, p. 7.

advance of civilisation, the increase of wealth, do not render some degree of change in our outward forms of worship justifiable, if not necessary?

From this Jacobs moved on to the evolution of ritual throughout the history of the Jewish people. He then discussed the scanty ritual directions to be found in the new testament concerning the liturgical life of the early church. From here Dean Jacobs pressed to his conclusion.³³

1st. All such developments (of ritual) should be subservient to the promotion of the one great end - the worship of God in spirit and in truth.

2nd. They should not be altogether novel and unexampled, but should reverence and follow, as far as may be, the precedents of Christian antiquity, that we may continue in harmony with the spirit of the past.

3rd. Their growth should be natural, yet cultivated; neither forced nor hindered, but watched and guided by authority.

... it is undeniable, I think, that the spirit of the age demands some advance and improvement in matters of Ritual. The general prevalence of this spirit is proved by the fact that it has manifested itself not only in the Church of England, but amongst all religious bodies, - Wesleyans, Independents,

33 This is quoted in full because of its penetrating insights in some places, bold tolerance in others, but underlying it all a cautious conservatism as to the ritual developments he would like to see in Canterbury.

and even the most undemonstrative of all, the Presbyterians. Now, it is not wisdom to ignore or to resist a generally prevailing spirit such as this, but to endeavour to keep it within bounds, to guide and regulate it. On the other hand, we may call upon those who are earnest in promoting the revival or development of Ritual, especially those charged with the cure of souls, to be tender and considerate of prejudices, to temper their zeal with moderation, to beware of putting stumbling-blocks in the way of the weak and feeble-minded; above all, to remember that the winning of souls to Christ, and building them up in him, are the great objects of their ministry, and that everything else should be considered with reference to these, whether it is a help or hindrance to the promotion of these ends. Let them not introduce such changes against the wishes of their people, and let them loyally and cordially submit to the decisions of the Bishop, and of the Synods of the Church.

On the other hand, we may surely exhort the weaker bretheren to become a little stronger, and a little more charitable too; not to be always imputing motives, nor suspecting ulterior designs; not to be offended if a clergyman thinks it more reverential to stand in front of his people and lead them rather than to face them in their approaches to the throne of Mercy;

nor to cry Popery if another thinks a Biretta- whatever that may be; for I should not know one if I saw it - nor to cry Popery, I repeat, if another thinks a Biretta a more suitable and more clerical-looking head-dress for solemn occasions than a hat or a wide-awake. To raise these false alarms is the surest way of realising our own fears. "God hath not given us the spirit of fear, but of power, and of love, and of a sound mind". Not that I would by any means wish to be understood that I have mainly in view such matters as those I have just referred to when I speak of developments of Ritual, but rather such points as the adoption of special services for particular occasions, including Processional services, which I think, are particularly solemn and the introduction of more varied and joyous services for the great festivals.

More reasonableness, more forbearance, more charity, I repeat are what we need on both sides; a disposition to discuss proposed improvements calmly on their merits; a greater regard to unity, and a more willing submission to authority.³⁴

Like Bishop Harper, his plea for tolerance and gradual tolerance does not seem to have been based on a knowledge of the more "advanced" practices which avant garde ritualists were getting up to in Britain.

34 CN, Sept 1871, pp. 3-4.

An animated discussion followed the Dean's address and (the) two prominent laymen expressed attitudes typical of many of Canterbury's laity. ~~Mr~~ John Grigg denounced all ritualistic practices, while the Hon J. B. Acland spoke of his evangelical family background which was opposed to ritualism and yet taught him to turn to the East for the recitation of the creed. He had worshipped in a small North Devonshire church untouched by the Oxford movement where, nevertheless, all the parishioners bowed towards the altar on entering and leaving the church.

But the taste of the laity was slowly changing towards a more ornate type of service and clerical dress as Canterbury moved beyond its early colonial days. In December 1875 Bishop Harper was presented with a pastoral staff and crozier. Like the English laity of the 1860s, the people of Canterbury found the pastoral staff to be a historic and useful symbol rather than a party badge. Indeed, with their sheep farming economy it was an especially relevant symbol. This comes out clearly in the Dean's presentation speech:

My Lord, we do not wish to see
the office of Bishop, or of Primate,
in this our adopted country,
surrounded with the trappings of
earthly greatness ... but we
recognise in the pastoral staff
and crozier the tokens of a
kingdom which is not of this world.³⁵

For the moment a deceptive peace reigned over the diocese as Christchurch lagged comfortably behind the English trend to fierce party strife. The Church News report on the 1875 Easter parish meetings gave utterance to the general feeling of satisfaction at this state of affairs:

35 CN, Jan 1876, p.35.

At the present time when party spirit in Church matters runs so high in England and elsewhere, we cannot but regard it as a ground of great satisfaction and thankfulness, that the spirit of unanimity and concord has prevailed so generally at these parish meetings ... It would be Utopian to expect that this harmony will never be disturbed; but we have, at any rate, at present the vantage ground of peace. It would require something almost amounting to a deliberate effort to stir up discord in our camp to any serious extent; and not only may we hope that no one may be found to incur so grave a responsibility, but we feel pretty confident, that should such an effort be made, all moderate and peace-loving men amongst us would combine to quench the flame at once, before it has time to spread. Throughout the history of Canterbury hitherto, there has been a very happy absence of party spirit in Church matters - comparatively speaking, at any rate - so, for the future, let us know no party but the Church.³⁶

The tumultuous events of the next year were to reveal just how fragile this peace was.

35 CN, May 1876, p. 35.

CHAPTER 1V

THE CARLYON CASE

Kaiapoi was one of the first Canterbury communities to have a parish church. It was low church, even for those days. Kaiapoi's former vicar had been Canon W. W. Willock, one of Canterbury's more capable priests, but the people had not fully accepted him and there was a certain reserve between parson and parish.

Willock's successor was a young English priest, the Reverend H. E. Carlyon. A recently ordained graduate of Cambridge, he had held a living in Cornwall for three years, before coming out to New Zealand in 1875. He seems to have had a winning personality, for despite the storm of opposition he aroused, he had many devoted admirers. Bishop Harper thought him a hard working and diligent priest. But he was no moderate. In his English cure he had used many of the new practices of the ritualists and fully intended to introduce them at Kaiapoi. His new parishioners seem to have been unaware of his churchmanship and his intentions.

On 4 June, 1875, Carlyon was introduced to the Kaiapoi vestry. He told the vestry that, having consulted the bishop, he proposed to make certain alterations in the services of the church and proceeded to explain the changes. The bishop instituted Carlyon on 6 June. The next day the vestry approved the changes by a slender majority. The changes involved the holy communion being celebrated on all sundays and saints days at 8a.m., and also an evening service with sermon on wednesdays and holy days at 7p.m.

For the first few weeks Carlyon made no changes in either his ceremonial practices or in the church furnishings. On 5 July the annual general meeting of parishioners elected two additional vestrymen without incident.

Shortly after this Carlyon began to introduce ceremonial innovations in worship and opposition began to develop. R. S. Bean, a vestryman, resigned in protest against the incumbent's innovations and a special general meeting of parishioners was convened on 15 November to elect a new vestryman. Controversy was in the air and whereas only 20 people had attended the annual parish meeting, 40 parishioners came to the special meeting. An attempt to elect another vestryman was thwarted by an amendment which read as follows:

That the parishioners present at this meeting decline to elect a Vestryman until an opportunity has been afforded them of discussing the affairs of the Parish and enquiring into the general conduct of the incumbent.¹

The amendment passed on a division by two votes and a majority of the vestry signed a requisition to the same effect.

Carlyon consulted Bishop Harper, who decided to set up a commission of inquiry to be presided over by Dean Jacobs. Jacobs was probably chosen because he was the most senior clergyman next to Bishop Harper. The bishop thought this a more just method of proceeding than allowing an aggrieved body of Kaiapoi parishioners to sit in judgement on their vicar, particularly when some might not be communicants. Accordingly on 22 November a special parish meeting was held, to which

1 Kaiapoi Vestry Minutes, 15 Nov 1875.

about 55 people came. Dean Jacobs explained to the meeting the nature of the proposed inquiry and the way in which it would be conducted. All charges would be taken down in writing, with the incumbent's replies, and the usual rules of evidence would apply as to the exclusion of hearsay evidence. These would then be forwarded to the bishop. The dean would be guided in his conduct of the inquiry by two assessors, Messrs Josiah Birch and Caleb Whitefoord, who were both magistrates.² When the dean had finished his explanation, J. Beswick moved:

That the parishioners request the
present incumbent to resign.³

Beswick alleged, amongst other things, that Carlyon was corrupting the minds of the confirmation candidates by a book on examination of conscience from which he quoted questions referring to sexual misconduct. A pro-Carlyonist, E. McKenna, tried to stop the bitter tirade by moving an amendment to proceed with the next business, but was frustrated on a point of order by E. Revell. The meeting continued in an acrimonious and disorderly fashion for some time, with personal attacks rather than Christian charity being the order of the day. Carlyon was presiding over the meeting and found it difficult to defend himself and remain a fair chairman. However the vestrymen steered the debate to a more edifying level by arguing against Carlyon's being condemned before he had a chance to defend himself before a properly constituted court of inquiry. Beswick argued that the meeting was legally competent to judge Carlyon, that the bishop had no right to interfere in the matter, and that his earlier revelation should be the basis on which the

2 Birch was vicar's warden and Whitefoord was people's warden, a fact which caused some comment later on.

3 Kaiapoi Vestry Minutes, 22 Nov 1875.

parishioners should judge the incumbent. The meeting, however, voted to agree to the enquiry and to adjourn till after its conclusion.

The commission on inquiry sat that night and again on 26 November. A mass of charges and evidence was given which may be grouped under three headings: Charges relating to doctrinal error, to ceremonial observances, and to self-examination and confession. Carlyon was accused of teaching the doctrine of the real presence, that the dead pray for the living, and of declaring Mary to be the greatest saint who ever lived. Of charges relating to ceremonial observances Carlyon defended the practices of mixing water with the wine at the offertory, taking the eastward position before the communion table, elevating the blessed sacrament at the consecration, and of making the sign of the cross with the chalice when administering it. He also defended himself against the charge that he had re-baptized two young people without proper prior examination or the proper form of service. He admitted without defence that he had allowed a server, or acolyte, within the communion rails, but had discontinued the practice at the bishop's order. He also admitted to placing two seven branched candlesticks within the communion rails, teaching children to bow at the name of Jesus and requiring them to stand when he entered the church at the children's service. He denied whispering secret prayers during the creed, crossing himself or bowing at the communion table, engaging in idolatrous adoration of the consecrated elements, or requiring the adult congregation to stand when he entered the church. But the fiercest controversy raged around the charges relating to self-examination and confession. As in England, the New Zealand Victorian patriarch feared that private confession to a priest would reveal the most intimate details

of family life and undermine his authority over wife and children. Carlyon was charged with requiring young and old to attend the confessional and, in particular, with refusing to allow confirmation candidates to go forward for confirmation unless they made their confession either personally or in writing. It was also alleged that Carlyon had distributed manuals on self-examination and confession to the confirmation candidates which were morally corrupting, and that he had told the children not to show them to their parents. A storm of moral indignation was unleashed as excerpts relating to sexual temptation were read out. All these charges were denied by Carlyon who said that he had urged his people to go to confession but had never commanded them. The manuals were impure only in the eyes of impure beholders. He had asked the confirmation candidates to keep their manuals in a safe place, not to hide them from their parents. By and large the evidence taken under cross examination tended to support Carlyon's defence. But this issue caused even the stoutest defender of Carlyon to quail. McKenna had prevented his son from going to confession and had told Carlyon that his children could only go to confession in later life if they still wanted to.

The commission of inquiry then handed over the evidence to the bishop for his deliberation. But due to a misunderstanding, between the Kaiapoi commissioners and the reporters of the two daily newspapers, the whole mass of evidence was published in The Lyttelton Times and The Press before it was placed in the hands of the bishop. This caused him considerable embarrassment as Carlyon had stated in the evidence that his custom of mixing water with the wine was sanctioned by the bishop, which was in direct contradiction to a written answer given by him at the 1875 synod in reply to a question on the legality of the mixed chalice. This led to some correspondence

between the dean and the bishop in both daily papers, in which the dean, at the urgent request of several leading churchmen, asked the bishop to explain the apparent discrepancy. In reply Bishop Harper published two letters he had written to Carlyon on the subject in July. Carlyon had asked him to sanction the practice and in his first letter the bishop declined to do so (while approving of the custom) on the grounds that the rubric made no provision for it. When Carlyon asked again for the sanctioning of the mixed chalice the bishop replied that he would not object to the practice being continued provided that the consent of the vestry was received. The bishop admitted that he had given his reply in synod without sufficient thought and had forgotten his second letter to Carlyon.

On 20 December the bishop met the Kaiapoi vestry and commenting later on this meeting in his pastoral letter to the churchwardens he wrote:

you may have gathered from my comments on the evidence in support of the charges brought against the Rev. H. E. Carlyon, before the Commission of Inquiry, that, while fully admitting that in several instances connected with his ministrations he had acted very injudiciously, I leant towards the opinion that it was due to him, and for the interests of the Church, that he should still exercise his ministry in the cure of Kaiapoi.⁴

He promised to give them a formal written statement of his conclusion and to write to some of the parishioners who had made complaints but were not members of the vestry.

4 A letter from the Bishop of Christchurch to the Churchwardens and Vestrymen of the Parish of Kaiapoi, 1876. N

But the people of Kaiapoi did not wait quietly for the bishop's decision. On New Year's eve Carlyon was preaching at the midnight service when the congregation was suddenly startled by a loud noise of drum-beating and bell-ringing outside. In the confusion a woman fainted while several men rushed outside to find two men with a big drum and a bell left in the wake of the rapidly retreating noise-making party. A scuffle ensued in which the drum was slashed. The noise-makers claimed that they were not on church ground but had gone to a cottage nearby to serenade a newly married couple. Others were convinced that it was an anti-Carlyon demonstration.

In January 1876 the foremost opponents of Carlyon set up a rival sunday school to protect the youth of the parish from practices which they regarded as corrupting. The official sunday school was run by two of Carlyon's staunchest allies. By late 1877 each sunday school had a roll of about 80 children.

In that same month Bishop Harper's pastoral letter to the churchwardens and vestrymen of Kaiapoi came out. It was a well argued plea for tolerance, which was remarkable for a colonial bishop in such a decidedly low church diocese. In it he stated his opinion that Carlyon should continue in his office at Kaiapoi, and he reviewed the more important charges that the commission of inquiry had elicited. On the basis of direct evidence Carlyon was charged with errors in doctrine relating to the condition of departed souls, the ceremonial and sacramental character of Christ's religion and ministry, and the nature of the ministry of reconciliation:

I have carefully perused these documents, and am bound to say that I can find no doctrine in them which, in my judgement, is

inconsistent with the teaching of
the Bible or the Church, or which
a clergyman in our communion is
not at liberty to teach.⁵

He felt that some of the statements were a little overstrained, and that the congregation had not been sufficiently prepared for this teaching, but that none of the doctrines referred to were outside the comprehensive teaching of the English church. With regard to charges relating to ceremonial observances Bishop Harper sanctioned Carlyon's taking the eastward position before the lord's table because it had obtained a certain sanction from immemorial custom and because the bishops and archbishops of the English church attached no doctrinal significance to it. But the bishop ordered Carlyon to discontinue mixing water with the wine and other ceremonial observances, such as the elevation of the chalice, which communicants had objected to. He did this not because they were symbolic of erroneous doctrine but because:

they certainly have failed at
Kaiapoi in promoting those devout
and reverential feelings which are
and ought to be the chief end of
all ceremonial observances.⁶

The bishop criticised those who had accused Carlyon of "idol worship" and pointed out that Carlyon had nowhere admitted to worshipping a localised presence in the bread and wine. Nor could Carlyon's belief in the doctrine of the real presence be confused with the roman doctrine of the transubstantiation or the lutheran doctrine of consubstantiation. A belief in the real presence of Christ in the eucharist in a heavenly manner was characteristic of some of the most devout members of the

5 Bishop to Kaiapoi Vestrymen, p. 3.

6 Bishop to Kaiapoi Vestrymen, p.4.

anglican communion. With regard to the matter of self examination and confession Bishop Harper found the books distributed by Carlyon to be useful and edifying for all, and that their special warnings on infringement of the seventh commandment:

are most seasonable and desirable.⁷

He declared Carlyon to be right in requiring his confirmation candidates to examine themselves before God and in urging them to come to him for guidance and counsel.

He did feel that Carlyon had laid too much stress on the necessity for confession and that in the case of under age children he had not taken enough account of the duties and responsibilities of parents. Confession in the Church of England was not for habitual use but for those who could not overcome special difficulties on their own. Summing up his opinion of Carlyon's conduct the bishop said:

In his eagerness to carry out his ministry in ways which he found to be useful and successful in his English cure, he seems to me not to have sufficiently considered that such ways were novelties at Kaiapoi, and from their likeness to usages which are associated in the minds of some with errors in religion, liable to be misunderstood.

It is my intention to forward to Mr Carlyon a copy of this letter, and to point out to him certain alterations in his mode of celebrating the Holy Communion, which I consider expedient ... And

7 Bishop to Kaiapoi Vestrymen, p.6.

if I am entitled, by my office,
to request this of Mr Carlyon, and
to expect his compliance, I am
equally entitled to ask and expect
of those who have objected to his
use of these observances, that they
will refrain from hasty and inconsiderate judgement, both as regards his
teaching and other ministrations.⁸

On 14 January, 1876, Bishop Harper duly wrote to Carlyon requesting him to desist from a number of ceremonial observances, including mixing water with the wine, and elevating the chalice during the prayer of consecration.

But the vestry did not act as the bishop had hoped for on 24 January they convened an adjourned special general meeting to discuss the primate's reply. A letter was read from Carlyon in which he declined to chair the meeting as its convening was in disobedience to the bishop's decision. Josiah Birch, a churchwarden, then took the chair and copies of the bishop's letter were distributed amongst the members of the meeting. It quickly became apparent that some parishioners were against the bishop's decision and thought they should have the final voice as to Carlyon's future at Kaiapoi. Despite several commendations of Carlyon's zeal as a pastor a motion was proposed requesting him to resign. An attempt by Dr Fletcher to amend the motion out of existence, by moving that the bishop's decision be accepted, was defeated. Instead the following words were added to the original motion:

That should the Incumbent not comply
with the request the matter be laid
by the Churchwardens before the

8 Bishop to Kaiapoi Vestrymen, p.8.

standing Committee of Synod.⁹

The resolution passed with a majority of seven. The anti-Carlyonists were in a strong position, for the debate had revealed that some vestry members and parishioners were boycotting Kaiapoi church services in protest, and that even Birch, who favoured accepting the bishop's decision, was worried by Carlyon's emphasis on confession. They then consolidated their position by passing the following resolution:

That a copy of the foregoing resolution be forwarded to the Bishop, that the Bishop be assured that the Vestry is authorised to pay the Stipend up to Easter on receiving the resignation of the Incumbent.¹⁰

But at the end of the meeting the anti-Carlyonists suffered a surprising tactical defeat in the election of a new vestryman. Bean was narrowly defeated by Dr Fletcher, a pro-Carlyonist. Bitter feelings had been aroused by the meeting and on 28 January a letter appeared in The Press alleging that some of those who had voted for the resolution requesting Carlyon to resign were not bona fide churchmen as they had either seldom or never attended church.

On 31 January the vestry met and drew the incumbent's attention to the resolutions passed at the recent parish meeting. Birch then presented a petition signed by about 70 parishioners requesting him not to resign. Carlyon declared that he had no intention of resigning. The battle lines had been drawn.

9 Kaiapoi Vestry Minutes, 24 Jan 1876.

10 Kaiapoi Vestry Minutes, 24 Jan 1876.

Meanwhile the bishop was once again facing considerable public embarrassment, this time at the hands of Christchurch's religious journals. Although he had made a plea for tolerance and moderation, both the Church Magazine and the Church News had repudiated the bishop's decision, called for Carlyon's removal, and published lengthy criticisms of his doctrine. The Church Magazine had also pointed out the impropriety of the commission on inquiry's two assessors being Kaiapoi magistrates and parties to the suit. But the Church News presented a more thorny problem in that the 1875 synod had defined it as the official organ of the diocese, and had placed its management and general direction in the hands of a committee consisting of the bishop, three clergy, and three laymen, with the bishop exercising a veto over the acts of the committee. The 1875 synod had also elected Carlyon as one of the clerical representatives on the committee. In declaring:

that there will be no peace for the
parish of Kaiapoi, or for the
diocese of Christchurch, so long
as he holds his present office.¹¹

the official organ of the diocese was in direct conflict with the diocesan. Moreover the bishop's son, the Archdeacon of Timaru, inserted a letter in the Lyttelton Times and the Press asking the primate to define the church's teaching on the following three questions:

Does the Church recognise or recommend
any private or individual confession
beyond a voluntary unburdening of
conscience occasionally, of the
necessity of which the individual
is the judge? Does the church

11 CN, 5 Feb 1876.

recognise any doctrine or practice which implies adoration of the consecrated elements in Holy Communion? Is it, in your Lordship's judgement, unnecessary to be on our guard in these times, lest the truth, as held by the Church Catholic in primitive times, and on which the Church takes her stand, be corrupted by the re-introduction of Romish error.^{12 7}

Bishop Harper replied by publishing an open letter to the editor of the Church News, together with a postscript in answer to the three inquiries of the Archdeacon of Timaru. In it he stated that he did not wish to restrict freedom of opinion in the Church News. However he would prefer the editor to express contrary views to the bishop in the correspondence columns while maintaining a certain reserve in the articles. He took issue with the editor in his interpretation of the charge against Carlyon of adoring the consecrated elements. He denied that Carlyon believed and taught the doctrine of transubstantiation or adored a localised presence of Christ in the bread and wine. Rather, Carlyon worshipped the heavenly God under the forms of the consecrated elements and was justified in his belief in the real presence by a long tradition of anglican spirituality. Dealing with each of the archdeacon's enquiries in turn the bishop affirmed that the anglican church recognised the principle of private confession to be used in exceptional circumstances but never habitually. In answering the archdeacon's second enquiry the bishop defined anglican eucharistic doctrine in very much the

12 CN, March 1876, p. 67.

same terms as used in the open letter. It was both right and proper for clergymen to offer up private prayers after the consecration so long as this did not disturb the congregation or imply that there was a localised presence in the bread and wine. In reply to the third enquiry the bishop said that while the roman catholic church had been extremely active of late, and had won over some distinguished anglicans, theological liberalism and protestant private judgement were equally dangerous enemies to be guarded against.

It is difficult to establish what was said at the Church News management committee meetings. One Press correspondent alleged that the committee had forced the editor to take an opposing line to the bishop, but this was denied by one of the committee members. What is certain is that Carlyon resigned from the committee on the grounds that the paper had departed from its purpose by opposing the bishop and because he wanted to protest against the unsound theological views of the editor. In the next edition of the Church News the editor rejected the bishop's reasoning, in the politest possible way, and continued his opposition to Carlyon. For his part Carlyon engaged in a lengthy debate with the editors and correspondents of the Church Magazine and Church News on eucharistic doctrine. In the long term this was a tactical mistake for one of his letters was later used as evidence against him in his trial before the bishop's court. It also brought to the public's attention the fact that, while in England, Carlyon had signed a petition organised by anglo catholic clergy to oppose Prayer Book reform, and that he was also a member of the Confraternity of the Blessed Sacrament.

Back in Kaiapoi both factions were contending for position. The anti-Carlyonists, baulked by Carlyon's refusal to resign, sent a deputation to the standing committee of synod with a petition bearing 108 names.

The memorialists wanted the standing committee to request Carlyon to resign. After a heated debate the standing committee adopted the following resolution:

That the Standing Committee are not at present in a position to take into consideration the matters contained in the memorial, not having been called upon by the Bishop to assist him in the conduct of an investigation into the questions at present affecting the peace and welfare of the Church at Kaiapoi.¹³

Bishop Harper told the deputation that they could take their remedy under a general synod statute appointing ecclesiastical courts if they thought that Carlyon had acted or taught wrongly. One of the deputation wrote to the bishop and asked him if this meant that they should lay charges against the incumbent or if it was the bishop's duty to do so. When they had received the bishop's reply the memorialists set about the involved business of preparing a legal suit against Carlyon.

Most of the anti-Carlyonists were boycotting his services and on 2 April Caleb Whitefoord, churchwarden and lay-reader, received a petition from 38 parishioners requesting him to conduct sunday services in the Orange Lodge Hall.¹⁴ On 6 April he received another petition signed by 26 parishioners who wanted him to request the bishop to take the Easter services at Kaiapoi and administer the holy communion, since they would not receive the sacrament from the incumbent, or attend any of his other services.¹⁵

13 CN, Mar 1876, p. 67.

14 It is reputed that the Orange Lodge marched through the streets of Kaiapoi with band and banners in protest against Carlyon's activities.

15 The bishop replied that he had a prior commitment at Woodend and 25 Kaiapoi parishioners went there on Easter Sunday to receive the sacrament at the bishop's hand.

The pro-Carlyonists were rallying their forces. On 24 April they succeeded in stacking the annual general meeting, which attracted a capacity crowd of 130 parishioners. Carlyon chose his old ally Birch for his churchwarden, and with the election of pro-Carlyonist Dr Fletcher as people's warden, it soon became apparent which side was in control of the meeting. A solidly pro-Carlyonist vestry was then elected. Their opponents, realising that the meeting was going against them, staged a dramatic walk out before the formalities were completed.

Carlyon and his new vestry were soon embroiled in controversy with The Church News, which had said of the April general meeting:

We are informed, however, and that on the very best authority, that the majority (which elected the pro-Carlyonist vestry) was made up, to a considerable extent, of persons registered for the occasion, who not only were unknown as resident Churchmen, but in some cases were only too well known as persons of disreputable character.¹⁶

The vestry met in early May and passed a motion declaring:

That the article in question is maliciously false and a gross libel and that the Editor of the Church News be requested to furnish, at once, the name of the "very best authority" on which the statement was made.¹⁷

16 CN, May 1876, p. 96.

17 Kaiapoi Vestry Minutes, 3 May 1876.

To which the editor of the Church News replied:

I am not at liberty to give the names of the gentlemen on whose authority the statements were made, but I may add that further information since received has convinced me that they are strictly true.¹⁸

The incensed Kaiapoi vestry tabled a motion calling on its lay synod representatives to place the matter before synod and to see justice done to the parish.¹⁹

Throughout 1876 an exchange of letters took place between Carlyon and the bishop. They reveal a growing exasperation between a bishop who respected the pastoral zeal of his immoderate priest and a priest who respected his diocesan's charity. The bishop had the greatest difficulty in trying to persuade Carlyon to give up the mixed chalice. Carlyon protested that he did not know what the bishop was referring to when he wrote: (Harper)

I entreat you do not persist in little points either in the Church or Parish which experience has shewn ... are likely to give offence.²⁰

People would persist in trying to bring about his resignation unless the bishop told them that they were wasting their time.

Carlyon then asked the bishop if he would write a foreward to two pamphlets he was re-printing²¹ so as

18 Copy of letter received from Editor of Church News, 20 May, 1876, Kaiapoi Vestry Minutes.

19 So far as I am aware nothing more was heard of the matter.

20 Carlyon to Harper, 7 Feb 1876: Diocesan Archives 13/5.

21 Presumably Does the Church of England sanction Auricular Confession and What is Ritualism?

to remove prejudices. The bishop thought the pamphlets advocated extremist ritualism and had no intention of lending his name to such an indiscrete publication.

Carlyon replied:

I for one should characterize it as the height of folly to attempt to carry out an elaborate ritual in a Church where Protestantism had prevailed.

My present mode of conducting Divine Service is far below the standard positively prescribed by the Book of Common Prayer and the only reason why I thus deliberately neglect to obey the Church is that I wish to teach the people to desire conformity and so to make it as much their act as my own.²²

It was the consecration of St Bartholomews in August which caused the bitterest exchange of letters. Carlyon had celebrated the eucharist at 8a.m. and therefore did not receive the sacrament at the main service at 11 a.m., at which the bishop was the celebrant. Bishop Harper was deeply hurt and accused Carlyon of not communicating with his bishop and the majority of his people because he had received the sacrament at a time more suited to his own devotional feelings. The equally wounded Carlyon replied:

The cruelty of your lordship's remarks about my resolution to adhere to religious observances most agreeable to myself or which approve themselves to my own judgement with the least possible consideration for others is no doubt not intended in all its horrible

meaning by your lordship for I have repeatedly said that I hate private judgement as the curse of our day, that I endeavour not to think of myself at all - but to do what I know to be God's will especially in matters which concern my relation to his people.²³

The increasing acrimony of these letters goes some of the way to explaining why Bishop Harper took such drastic action with the incumbent of Kaiapoi at a later stage.

Although there had been a church at Kaiapoi for sixteen years, St Bartholomews was as yet unconsecrated. The installation of a new organ gave Carlyon and his new vestry the opportunity they wanted to petition the bishop to perform the consecration. The anti-Carlyonists considered counter-petitioning the bishop not to perform the ceremony until parish affairs were more settled. But on reflection they decided that this would not achieve any useful purpose and instead boycotted the consecration service, which took place on 24 August.

By this time there had been considerable developments in church furnishings and liturgical innovations. The altar was covered by an embroidered white cloth decorated with scarlet and gold devices. On the altar were two flower vases, two single candlesticks, two three branched candlesticks, with a plain cross over the communion table. A re-table within the sanctuary was likewise covered with flowers and candles. The wood panelling of the reredos had been trimmed over with blue and gilt paper. There were two sets of seven branched candlesticks by the communion rails and the choir stalls. A raised platform had been extended from the chancel into the nave to accommodate the choir stalls. The choir

23 Carlyon to Harper, 28 Aug. 1876: DA 13/5

was now robed in cassocks and surplice, included introits and gregorian chants in its repertoire, and entered the church in solemn procession with a processional cross and banners. The celebrant was vested in cassock, surplice and coloured stoles. A considerable body of old parishioners were now attending non-conformist churches or other anglican services. Consequently the offertories had declined by about a quarter.

Of the many clergy invited to the consecration service only Archdeacon Harper and the Reverend Henry Cooper attended. The congregation was small (about 80) for such a grand occasion. As Cooper and Carlyon, with the choristers, all in cassocks with their surplices over their arms, proceeded through the streets to the consecration of the cemetery, insults and taunts were flung at them by some of the locals. In the evening Cooper preached a "forcible" sermon in which he held up the incumbent as a persecuted christian, and the anti-Carlyonists as those who had conspired to "fight against Jerusalem, to hinder it."

The synod of 1876 was long, lasting for thirteen days from the end of October into early November. It was general knowledge that Carlyon had been charged with errors in doctrine and ceremonial usage, and there was a general and tacit desire to avoid discussing those controversial questions which had been so much the subject of the 1875 synod. There was a minor sensation when Cooper and Carlyon unsuccessfully proposed that the synod adjourn for All Saints day to keep the feast. Bishop Harper's presidential address received the most attention from those interested in the Kaiapoi controversy. Speaking of the undesirable effects that the prosecution of Carlyon had, the bishop pointed out that while the Christchurch diocese was short of clergy, and wished to import more from England, it was unlikely

to recruit many priests due to insecurity of tenure. This is a key point in understanding Bishop Harper's tolerance of Carlyon's activities. If ritualists or tractarians were summarily thrown out of their livings and were denied episcopal protection and a fair trial, Christchurch would receive a bad name amongst English clergy who were thinking of emigrating to New Zealand. In his defence Carlyon was to make much of the fact that the New Zealand Church had confined its doctrine and practice within narrower limits than that permitted by the English Church. Security of tenure and principles of justice would be violated if, in a dispute between parson and parish, the aggrieved sat in judgement on their clergyman and enforced their decision. He pointed out the difficulties of New Zealand ecclesiastical law as it related to the Carlyon case. It was impossible for a clergyman to be speedily removed from his cure since neither the bishop nor the standing committee could summarily dismiss a man unless he had been proved guilty before a competent tribunal. Although general synod had prescribed a procedure to be followed before a clergyman could be found guilty and punished, it was doubtful whether this procedure could be carried out with a view to conviction:

The first duty of a bishop in dealing with such charges when as yet they have not taken the definite form and order prescribed by law, is "to follow after the things that make for peace" The duty of peace making is inherent in the office of a bishop, and however unsuccessful his efforts for the purpose may be, it is the more binding upon him because so far as it relates to religious opinion and teaching a

very considerable latitude is
allowed in our Church.²⁴

And this was particularly the case with the Holy Communion. Quoting lengthy extracts from the Bennet judgement he showed that anglicans are allowed a considerable diversity of beliefs about the eucharist, within certain limits laid by the Prayer Book. While the decisions of the Privy Council were not binding in New Zealand:

our church here will be justly chargeable with presumption and intolerance if in dealing with the teaching of our clergy it takes a narrower view of the liberty which under this judgement is accorded to their bretheren in the Mother Church.

Perhaps one of the hardest lessons which earnest-minded men have to acquire is that of maintaining what they conceive to be the truth with a due consideration for the opinions of others who may differ from them; and the truths connected with the Holy Communion, as was remarked in the course of the judgement, "have always moved the deepest feelings of religious men and will continue to do so".²⁵

He also quoted with approval Bishop Connop Thirlwall who stated that the most advanced ritualists had not overstepped the bounds of a belief in the real presence

24 CM, 15 Nov 1876, pp. 168-9.

25 CM, 15 Nov 1876, p. 170.

which the Church of England allowed. But the same liberty of action did not apply to clergyman giving ceremonial expression to these views:

a clergyman really has less liberty in this matter than individual worshippers ... For a clergyman is the minister of the Church, as it is, not as it has been, or may be; and is, moreover, the representative of the whole congregation, and not of those members of it alone who may sympathise with him in a desire for more ceremonial worship; and the more he values these religious truths which certain outward observances are supposed to symbolize, the more careful he should be, lest by an ill-advised introduction of them he creates in the minds of his people a prejudice against them.²⁶

It was the speech of a man being forced into an unsavoury course of action by an impossible situation. He was dubious about the desirability or effectiveness of a law suit but knew that the continuing controversy at Kaiapoi was doing the church a lot of harm. He desired unity and tolerance but was caught between a powerful, intransigent low church faction and a stubborn anglo catholic priest who disliked compromise.

In September of 1876 the dean and Caleb Whitefoord, J. C. Porter, William Wilson and Charles Dudley of Kaiapoi laid their accusations against the incumbent of Kaiapoi before the church advocate. On 21 September a copy of

26 CM, 15 Nov 1876, p. 171.

the charges was sent to Mr Carlyon. In general he was charged with maintaining doctrine contrary to the authorised teaching of the Church of England but more particularly he was charged with:

1. Teaching the obligation of auricular confession of sins to a priest, which he argued by sermon and by pamphlet, Does the C of E sanction Auricular Confession?...
2. Doctrine contrary to the C of E on the Sacrament of the Body and Blood in a letter to the N.Z. Church News, Mar 13, 1876, and in a separate pamphlet: "This is my Body and Blood being understood in a literal sense".
3. Nature of the Sacraments: "The nature of a Sacrament is the union of two substances in one".
4. It was claimed by Mr Carlyon that Jesus ordained the use of unleavened bread and a mixed ... chalice.
5. That he taught doctrine contrary to the C of E viz: "I maintain that the object of the Reformation as (sic) being to correct abuses, and not to abolish any ~~aincient~~ and Catholic custom, therefore, whatever custom in use at the time of the Reformation is not expressly forbidden, is expressly prescribed".
6. That he performed a baptismal service outside the course of the normal service - i.e. not following

the second lesson of Evening Prayer as laid down in the rubrics.

7. Nor did he ask if an adult had already been baptised.

8. And that in fact an adult (Emily Anne Spillard) had been baptised by a Wesleyan minister.

9. That he used wafers and not normal bread.

10. That he taught the lawfulness of elevating the consecrated elements.

11. That he "adores" the sacrament after consecration - "I believe in the Real Presence, and believing, I adore".

12. That the Prayer of Consecration is said with back to the people and therefore they are not able to see him break the bread and take the cup into his hands".²⁷

Carlyon gave no answer to the presentment beyond acknowledging its receipt. In doing this he showed a shrewd understanding of the weakness of the ecclesiastical tribunal statute which made no provision for this situation. The statute envisaged that the accused clergyman would provide a written answer to the charges, which would be laid before the bishop, who would decide if there was sufficient cause for the case to proceed. If the accused clergyman admitted the material facts of the charges the suit would then be laid before the bench of bishops for their decision. Since Carlyon had neither admitted nor denied the material facts of the charges the chancellor was uncertain what he should do next and took legal advice. On the basis of this advice he summoned the diocesan court of assessors to meet on 19

December to enquire into the facts alleged in the presentment. The assessors' task would be to see if the material facts of the charges could be proved and if their verdict affirmed this the case would be laid before the bench of bishops, who would decide if the doctrines and practices complained of were contrary to the authorised teaching of the Church of England.

On the day before the court met, one of the assessors, Archdeacon Lingard, wrote to the bishop stating that he would not be able to appear the next day due to bad health. Moreover, he urged that all proceedings in the case be stopped immediately for some very pertinent reasons. He believed that the ecclesiastical offences statute of 1874 was so badly worded that Carlyon could be neither tried nor convicted on the basis of the charges against him. He stated that, contrary to the relevant legislation on the matter, the bishop had failed to make any inquiry into the case, nor had he given as his opinion that sufficient cause existed for instituting proceedings in the bishop's court. Nor could he see how the chancellor of the diocese could be allowed to preside over the court when:

but for the pressure he brought to bear in the matter, the presentment would in all probability have never been made.²⁸

Although the chancellor was an interested party in the matter it would be his duty to sum up and direct the jury of assessors. Archdeacon Lingard then played his trump card:

I cannot but look upon the present proceedings as being taken without

28 Lingard to Harper, 18 Dec 1876; DA 13/5

your Lordship's consent, and in direct contradiction of your express decision in "the Kaiapoi case" in the early part of this year.²⁹

This is the most puzzling feature of the court proceedings. Bishop Harper could have prevented the case coming to court by declaring that there was insufficient cause for further proceedings. Although he made no formal declaration that sufficient cause did exist the fact that he allowed the assessors' court to sit and give its verdict without any protest on his part was tantamount to a formal pronouncement that sufficient cause did in fact exist. Yet almost all the charges against Carlyon were ones on which the bishop had acquitted him in the Kaiapoi pastoral. It would seem that the bishop was exasperated by Carlyon's stubborn refusal to compromise and bowed to the overwhelming pressure brought to bear on him by the low church party.

The court sat the next day, and all of the charges were either admitted by Carlyon or proved by witnesses, with the exception of the charge relating to the baptism of Emily Spillard. Several charges were slightly amended in form on the basis of evidence given before the court. The church advocate then laid the eleven proved charges before the bishops of Auckland, Wellington, Nelson and Dunedin for their decision.

The year 1877 was to be one of cumulative defeats for Carlyon as he tenaciously hung on to his curacy hoping to ride out the storm. Petty bitterness in the Kaiapoi community had reached the point where Carlyon was tried and convicted in the local magistrate's court by resident magistrate Whitefoord, one of his foremost critics, on a charge on allowing a horse to obstruct a footpath. The anti-Carlyonists were incensed when

29 Lingard to Harper, 18 Dec 1876; DA 13/5

the three hours' service was introduced on Good Friday 1877, particularly as it was taken by a layman who was not a licensed lay reader. They were also somewhat taken aback when the Reverend H. C. M. Watson, a visiting evangelical missionary, preached at St Bartholomews at an evening service in Holy Week.

Carlyon's first major defeat came at the annual parish meeting which was held at the unusual date and hour of 9 a.m., Easter monday. One of his critics later alleged that this was an attempt to prevent the opposition turning out in force by convening the meeting in the holiday season when many families would be away. The Press reporter thought that both sides were equally disadvantaged by the arrangement. Certainly the anti-Carlyonists were in a position of great strength for of the 91 registered members present only 26 were supporters of Carlyon with 65 against him. Carlyon nominated Birch to be his churchwarden for another year, but Whitefoord was elected as parishioner's churchwarden unopposed. Six of Carlyon's sternest critics were then nominated as vestrymen. None of them had attended St Bartholomews for some time. When Carlyon pointed out that churchwardens and vestrymen had to be communicants³⁰ he was told that they had communicated at other parish churches. Carlyon replied that as there had been no communion service at Woodend he would check to see if they had been to Rangiora. The nomination was unopposed, and the new vestry took office by default. Carlyon now had one ally and seven opponents on his vestry.

Throughout 1877 vicar and vestry were continually at loggerheads, not only over ceremonial and doctrinal issues but also over the rapidly deteriorating financial situation of the parish. The vestry was not prepared

30 They had to receive the sacrament at least three times a year, one of these times being Easter.

to wait for the bench of bishop's decision but tried to suppress Carlyon's ceremonial activities immediately.

On 23 April the vestry proposed:

That the churchwardens apply to the bishop for a faculty to remove from the Church at Kaiapoi the following articles, the use of which has been declared by the highest Ecclesiastical courts in England to be illegal - viz - All candles, and candlesticks not necessary for the efficient lighting of the Church - vases - table covers except such as are provided by the Vestry - Cross, retable or super altar, banners etc and that the Bishop be requested to inhibit the continuance of all processions with or without cross, coloured stoles, banners, bowing at the communion table and the employment of one or more acolytes within the communion rails which in the opinion of this Vestry are not only illegal but highly repugnant to a very large majority of the Parishioners.³¹

Carlyon ruled that the resolution could not be put to the vestry but would be referred to the bishop. Two other motions suffered the same fate. The first called on the churchwardens to inform the bishop that Carlyon had introduced two acolytes within the communion rails at Easter, despite the bishop's specific prohibition

31 Kaiapoi Vestry Minutes, 23 Apr 1877.

of this. The second was:

That in the opinion of this vestry
the Sermon delivered by the Incumbent
of the Parish Church of Kaiapoi in
defence of Mr (Arthur) Tooth now
under punishment for contempt of
the laws of England was not only
uncalled for but disloyal and that
it be referred to the Bishop.³²

On Pentecost Sunday the vestry forcefully expressed their disapproval of acolytes within the sanctuary. The vestryman who had collected the offertories pushed past the boy who was supposed to receive them and laid the offertory bags on the altar. The vestrymen then told Carlyon that they did not intend to recognise this acolyte, and having heard that he intended to use other people to collect the offertories, that they intended to maintain their right - by force if necessary. The next Sunday the incumbent dispensed with the usual sermon and instead denounced the vestry. In a letter to the offending parties he said that they did not come within the Prayer Book definition of "fit persons" to collect the offertory since they were not communicants, did not give any money, and on the few occasions when they did attend church they usually misbehaved themselves.

On 28 May the vestry resumed the attack by moving that the bishop's opinion be sought on the legality of various church ornaments which were not the property of the parish, namely, two brass vases, two three branched candlesticks and two brass crosses. The vestry also pressed for an inquiry by the bishop and the standing committee into the financial affairs

32 Kaiapoi Vestry Minutes, 23 Apr 1877. Arthur Tooth was the great anglo catholic martyr of the 1870's who had defied the verdict of the Privy Council and had been imprisoned. Perhaps Carlyon saw himself in the same light.

of the parish in connection with the payment of the incumbent's stipend. The parish was suffering from a considerable financial deficit and there seemed to be evidence that the incumbent had improperly manipulated the parochial funds. The parson - vestry relationship had become so antagonistic that it was resolved:

That as there are so many matters in dispute between the Incumbent, and the Vestry the Vestry requests his Lordship the Primate to name an early date to meet the Vestry and discuss these matters with a view to speedy settlement.³³

At about the same time the standing committee considered a letter from Birch, Carlyon's churchwarden, alleging that the recent canvass of the parish had been a failure because the vestrymen had encouraged parishioners to withhold their financial support. The diocesan treasurer reported that £18 had been paid as stipend to Carlyon on receipt of a larger amount purporting to be the Kaiapoi contribution to the diocesan stipend grant. However it seemed unlikely that this money had been raised from the Kaiapoi parishioners because it had been reported that Carlyon had repaid £47 to Josiah Birch on a loan raised to make up the local stipend quota. Archdeacon W. B. Dudley of Rangiora was requested to enquire into the two matters. On 12 June the standing committee learnt from Archdeacon Dudley's report that the Kaiapoi vestrymen had honestly tried to obtain promises of financial support from the parishioners. In his opinion there seemed to be no reasonable prospect of enough money being raised to pay Carlyon's stipend.

33 Kaiapoi Vestry Minutes, 28 May 1877. This meeting did take place but its outcome is unknown.

He also discovered that Birch had advanced £47 paid as a local contribution to the diocesan treasurer and that Carlyon had repaid Birch. Thus the £47 was not the local contribution of Kaiapoi. The standing committee asked Carlyon for an explanation of his actions. At their next meeting they inserted a letter from Carlyon in the minutes which stated that he had only done what many of his brother clergy did in similar circumstances. However the standing committee took a stern view of this and censured Carlyon, while recommending that synod amend the financial regulations to prevent such irregularities occurring in the future. Carlyon humbly apologised to the standing committee in July. On 14 August they received another letter from him stating that £35 was overdue to him in stipend. Dean Jacobs reported that no local contributions had been received in the last quarter of the financial year and Archdeacon Dudley was once again asked to visit the parish and enquire into the best means of supplying the deficiency.

However, by September Carlyon had more than a financial deficit to worry about. On 17 September he was notified that the bench of bishops had found him guilty of maintaining unauthorised doctrines and practices and that he was to appear at the Christ's College library on 10 October to have sentence passed on him by Bishop Harper. Of the twelve charges preferred against him the bench of bishops had found him guilty on seven counts. These were, teaching the obligation of auricular confession, holding doctrine contrary to the Church of England on the eucharist, performing a baptismal service outside the course of the normal service, not asking if an adult had already been baptised, using wafers and not normal bread, elevation of the chalice, and taking the eastward position at the prayer of consecration. It is hard to understand the long

delay of nine months, particularly as the bishops met several times at the general synod in March to discuss the case. One explanation advanced at the time was that they were waiting for the decision of the Privy Council in the Folkestone ritual case to decide on the legality of the eastward position. On 10 October about 50 people gathered in the Christ's College library for the delivery of the judgement. Bishop Harper read the decision of the bench of bishops and Carlyon was given an opportunity to speak in mitigation of his sentence. He proceeded to make a lengthy speech citing numerous patristic theologians, anglican divines and contemporary legal decisions in his defence. He complained of the unfairness of not being allowed to plead his case before the bench of bishops, on being condemned on isolated statements without reference to the general tenor of his writings, and of the narrowness of the New Zealand church which would not allow the same liberty of doctrine and practice permitted by the mother church. Bishop Harper then pronounced sentence, but not before he had revealed his mind on the matter:

It is a painful duty which I have to discharge - painful, because you, a clergyman of my diocese, are the First Clergyman in New Zealand against whom it has been found necessary to proceed in the Ecclesiastical Courts of this province, and towards whom I have to act judicially, and because I am persuaded that but for your unguarded language in statements of doctrine, and undue reliance on your own judgement in the use of public acts of religion, you might have done good service in this diocese.³⁴

34 CN, Oct supplement 1877, p. 10.

On charges nine, ten and twelve the bishop admonished Carlyon to abstain for the future in the celebration of the holy communion from the use of unleavened bread, the elevation of the consecrated elements, and the eastward position. On charges one and two Carlyon was suspended for one month from the ministry of the church, the suspension to continue until he had formally retracted his errors.

The Christchurch synod met six days later and became the forum for a discussion of the implications of the Kaiapoi judgement. The Reverend Croasdaile Bowen moved a series of motions regretting the effects of the judgement in confining the doctrine and practice of the New Zealand church within narrower limits than that allowed by the English church. The motions also called for the adoption of English ecclesiastical legal precedents as guides in further cases, with a liaison between the two churches which could refer to some ultimate authority in cases not covered by the precedents. The general tenor of the debate that followed was that, while many feared a weakening of the link between the two churches, the Kaiapoi judgement was thought to be so controversial that unanimity within the diocese would be threatened if the motion was pressed to a conclusion. At the expressed wish of the bishop the motions were withdrawn.

But Carlyon's friends and allies were not slow in coming to his defence. On 11 October McKenna wrote to the bishop to inform him that the parents of the children at the official Kaiapoi sunday school wished him to prevent the supporters of the opposition sunday school from effecting a take-over during the period of Carlyon's suspension. On 12 October 48 Kaiapoi parishioners petitioned the bishop to allow the official sunday school to carry on as before, to prevent any alterations

in the services at St Bartholomews, to prevent any furniture or ornaments being removed from the church, to ensure that the eucharist was celebrated at least once a month in the parish church, and to prevent anyone being licensed as a lay reader for the parish:

who does not hold the doctrines of
the Holy Catholic Church ... and who
has not been baptised and confirmed
in the Church.³⁵

The biggest demonstration of support took place on 19 October when a considerable number of people assembled at the Kaiapoi Institute. The meeting was dominated by the architect B. W. Mountfort who, ably assisted by the Revs. W. H. Cooper and C. Coates,³⁶ drafted a petition with 71 signatories to the primate and the bench of bishops protesting against their recent decision. The decision was declared to be:

Unjust, Impolitic, and Doctrinally
unsound... involving as it does
our own virtual expulsion from the
Church of the said Province.³⁷

Furthermore, they threatened that if the decision was upheld as final they would have to consider seceding from the anglican church to become old catholics:

We would ask you to define for us,
what is the Doctrine of the Church
of New Zealand on the points upon
which Mr Carlyon has been condemned,

35 Kaiapoi parishioners to Harper, 12 Oct 1877: DA 13/5

36 Coates was to discharge a long and fruitful ministry, devoid of catholic externals while employing moderate catholic teaching. He named his son Cyril Carlyon Coates out of admiration for the incumbent of Kaiapoi and one of the murals he painted on the walls of Holy Trinity, Lyttelton expresses a strongly held doctrine of the real presence of Christ in the eucharist. Holy Trinity, Lyttelton still has the processional cross which Carlyon gave to Charles Coates when he was turned out of Kaiapoi.

37 Carlyon papers: DA 13/5.

that we may have authoratative
data to guide us in the most
difficult choice which seems now
unhappily forced upon us.³⁸

Then, on the 22nd, Fred Funston, the Kaiapoi choirmaster, wrote to the bishop asking him to guarantee the future of the choir.

All this had little effect on Carlyon's future. That was being decided by an exchange of letters between himself and the bishop. On 29 October the bishop wrote to Carlyon to tell him that his plea in mitigation of his sentence could not be accepted as a retraction of erroneous doctrine. He enclosed a suggested form of retraction concerning the condemned statements on auricular confession and the eucharistic presence which he hoped Carlyon would be able to sign. His letter ended thus:

I am constrained however to add
that, under any circumstances, I
feel it necessary to ask you to
place your resignation of the
Incumbency of Kaiapoi in my hands.
It is unreasonable to expect, after
what has occurred, that your ministry
there, either now or hereafter, can
answer the purposes for which you
were instituted to the cure of the
parish.³⁹

In his reply of 5 November Carlyon declined to sign the suggested form of retraction. On 6 November the bishop put forward an alternative form of retraction, which Carlyon also declined to sign. On 10 November the bishop again urged him to sign the alternative form and on the

38 Carlyon papers: DA 13/5.

39 Harper to Carlyon, 29 Oct 1877: DA 13/5

13th he received Carlyon's last word on the matter:

While feeling very much for your
lordship's painful position between
the Bench of Bishops and myself,
and while acknowledging the kindly
endeavour you have made to satisfy
their lordship's popular opinion -
and myself - I still adhere to my
determination to endure the miseries
and losses of suspension rather than
commit myself to so palpable an act
of dishonesty and unfaithfulness to
the church, as to retract certain
words while mentally holding fast
to the doctrines expressed.⁴⁰

On 15 November the bishop informed Carlyon that unless he resigned his cure he would face the penalty of being removed from it. Furthermore he objected to Carlyon's plan to visit England to consult eminent theologians as to the legality of the Kaiapoi judgement as being an attempt to override the decision of the New Zealand Church, against which there could be no appeal. In these circumstances it would be impossible for him to licence Carlyon to another or any part of the diocese. The next day Carlyon asked for two years' leave of absence and completely ignored the bishop's request that he should resign. This was the last straw. Bishop Harper convened the standing committee and asked its members if they could recommend that he remove Carlyon from the incumbency of Kaiapoi. They did so recommend, and on 23 November Carlyon was formally removed from his cure.

But the bird had already flown. The Press of 21 November carried a report of Carlyon's farewell address

40 Carlyon to Harper, 13 Nov 1877; DA 13/5.

to his Kaiapoi supporters. He told them that it was his intention to go to England to obtain the advice of English theologians on the Kaiapoi judgement and that, unless advised to the contrary, he would return within a period of twelve months. He told them of the bishop's demand that he resign or be removed from the parish and stated that he had no intention of resigning. Furthermore he hoped that his friends would not support any other priest who might be appointed while there was a possibility that he might return from England. In the meantime they were to maintain their unity as a party without bitterness towards their opponents.

But all of Carlyon's plans came to nothing. Bishop Harper swiftly appointed another priest to Kaiapoi. In January Bishop A. B. Suter of Nelson wrote to Bishop Harper in answer to the Mountfort memorialists to say:

speaking for myself I must decline to enter into any discussion of the merits of the decision ... As to putting forth new definitions as they propose, that appears to me both unnecessary and inopportune.⁴¹

Nor was Carlyon to have any luck with the English theologians he consulted. On 20 July, 1878, he sent a retraction of error to Bishop Harper, who accepted it with alacrity. His retraction of error in charge one, relating to auricular confession, was almost word for word that first proposed by Bishop Harper. And with regard to the condemned statements in charge two:

Before consecration there is on the altar, on the paten and in the cup, one reality, after consecration there are on the altar, on the paten and in the cup, two realities - an earthly and a heavenly.

⁴¹ Suter to Harper, 17 Jan 1878; DA 13/5

The words "This is my Body, This is my Blood" are to be understood in a literal sense.

Carlyon wrote:

I am advised by eminent theologians, on whose opinion I can rely, that my statement, while more than capable of an orthodox interpretation, may nevertheless imply doctrines which are unorthodox, namely, that the first expression may be taken to teach the "Lutherine doctrine of Consubstantiation" and that the word "literal" in the second expression may be understood to imply a gross carnal presence.

I am consequently advised to retract them, and do hereby do so.⁴²

Carlyon spent the next ten years of his life in South Africa. In that time he held a variety of posts, rarely staying in one place for longer than three years. In 1889 he returned to England where he spent the rest of his life.

The Carlyon case reveals an accurate picture of the relative strengths of the anglo catholic and low church parties in the diocese of Christchurch. The anglo catholic party was small but capable of putting up quite a fight in defence of its interests. The intransigency of Carlyon had the effect of raising its expectations as to the impact and influence of anglo catholicism on the diocese. The low church party was militant and numerically the stronger. The broad mass of anglican laity and the bench of bishops seem to have been sympathetic to its point of view. The

42 C G, Nov 1878, p. 125.

fact that the ecclesiastical newspapers, and in particular The Church News, came out against Carlyon probably had a considerable influence on the public reaction to the events at Kaiapoi. The ousting of Carlyon must be reckoned to be a victory for the low church party, with a consequent retardation of the development of anglo catholicism in the diocese.

Bishop Harper is revealed as a man of tolerance with an understanding and appreciation of the Oxford movement. His motivations in the case were threefold. He was sympathetic to moderate tractarianism and wished to see a broader range of anglican attitudes within the diocese. He feared that an unjust persecution of Carlyon would cut off the supply of English clergy to New Zealand. The stubbornness of Carlyon and the militancy of the low church party forced Harper to abandon the way of compromise and allow the prosecution to take place. The overwhelming pressure brought to bear on Bishop Harper must not be underestimated. He was accused of infiltrating ritualist clergy into the diocese and of manipulating the patronage system to force ritualist clergy on his people. It was dangerous to resist this kind of pressure, particularly as other colonial bishops were finding it difficult to convince their low church clergy and laity that the episcopacy was an essential component of church order, and not a functional convenience to be dispensed with if necessary.

There is one final puzzling feature of the Carlyon case. Anglo catholicism thrives on heroic myths about its origins. Its most venerated pioneers are often martyrs from an earlier age of persecution. The Carlyon case has all the essential ingredients for a fondly cherished story of heroic martyrdom. Surprisingly

the story of Carlyon and the tumultuous events at Kaiapoi is not widely known among New Zealand anglo catholics. A valuable piece of folk lore has not been appropriated by the inheritors of Carlyon's tradition.

CHAPTER V

PHILLIPSTOWN

Throughout the 1860's early Christchurch began to spread beyond the boundaries of the four avenues. The city's eastward expansion created several new suburbs, one of which was Phillipstown. Situated between Avonside and Sydenham, Phillipstown was a working class suburb "inhabited chiefly by labourers, artisans, cabmen etc."¹

In 1876 it was constituted a parochial district in an area known as Columbo Rd and Phillipstown. Its place of worship was a small mission chapel capable of holding 170 people. By 1879 the population of this part of Christchurch had increased to the point where the parochial district of Columbo Rd was detached from Phillipstown to form the parish of St. Saviour's, Sydenham.

In 1880 the Reverend H.J.C. Gilbert became the second vicar of Phillipstown. He was the first priest to wear eucharistic vestments in the diocese of Christchurch and perhaps, even in New Zealand. The parish history of Phillipstown alleges that Gilbert was formerly a Wesleyan minister but this is highly unlikely since he was confirmed in his native Cornwall by Bishop Wilberforce in 1859. He emigrated to New Zealand at an early age and studied for the ministry under Dean Jacobs. Gilbert was ordained a deacon in 1872. From 1872 to 1877 he was curate of Waimea, Westland and then transferred to the Dunedin diocese where he held the

1 CN, Oct 1882, p. 184.

incumbency of Tapanui. In this early stage of his ministry he gave no hint of being a ceremonialist, for in a letter of testimonial² the Bishop of Dunedin, Bishop S.T. Nevill wrote:

I may add that no complaints were made to me of the manner in which you conducted divine service nor of your teaching, and that to the best of my knowledge and belief you attended with assiduity to the duties of your cure.

Probably what changed him was the strongly anglo catholic lay element at Phillipstown, led by B.W. Mountfort. Within two years of his arrival Gilbert applied for a grant to build a church, which was designed by Mountfort. In his appeal for church furniture in 1884 the vicar made his churchmanship quite clear:

If people are to be taught reverence for holy Sacraments, and that the House of God differs from common houses then something must appeal to the eye as well as to the ear.

I shall be glad, therefore, if any who are disposed to help in maintaining the good old Catholic usages of the Church would communicate at once with either Mr B.W. Mountfort, the architect, or myself ...³

In that year the foundation stone was laid and in 1885

2 Mss dated April 30 1880; "H.J.C. Gilbert" 'Various papers deposited by the Rev Canon W.A. Orange' C.D.A.

3 CN, Sept 1884, p. 177.

the nave was built with a temporary wooden sanctuary. The Church of the Good Shepherd is one of Mountfort's finest creations and with its conspicuous high altar, and the ascending levels of footpaces in the sanctuary, it is an obviously anglo catholic structure.

It has been suggested⁴ that Mountfort designed it with a view to having a suitable church to worship in during his retirement. Certainly he was a faithful parishioner and churchwarden of Phillipstown for the rest of his life. It was he who gave Gilbert a set of white linen eucharistic vestments. Benjamin Mountfort and Hannibal Gilbert were close friends and Mountfort succeeded in impressing many catholic principles on the vicar of Phillipstown. He had a willing pupil for Gilbert had come to know and respect the Reverend H. E. Carlyon during the latter's turbulent years at Kaiapoi. In this Phillipstown episode Mountfort was probably the central figure, and a close examination of his character and views if therefore necessary.

Mountfort was trained as an architect by Richard Carpenter, the darling of the Cambridge ecclesiologists. He came out to Canterbury in 1850 on the Charlotte Jane and was the foremost anglo catholic laymen of the diocese. His organising of the petition protesting against the Kaiapoi judgement made him one of the staunchest defenders of the Reverend H. E. Carlyon. His churchmanship stemmed from his admiration of Camden Society principles gained during his training in England:

Mountfort would have been familiar with Ecclesiological thought through his association with Carpenter and his churches reflect this interest quite strongly. The elements which

4 Interview, Archdeacon R. J. P. Witty, 13 July, 1975.

derive from the ideas put forward by the Ecclesiologists can be seen in his respect for "truth to materials" i.e. not making wood look like stone or the other way round; the "picturesque" planning of the churches, i.e. irregular plans which reflect on the outside the different functions of the interior; his use of a chancel divided into two levels, the first being raised above the level of the nave by one or two steps then going up possibly another step to the altar; and of course the most obvious one, his adoption of the gothic style.⁵

Apart from his contribution to New Zealand anglo catholicism as an enthusiastic layman his impact on early Canterbury church building was considerable. As the local supervising architects of the Cathedral in 1873 he had a virtual monopoly of church designs. In this office he built up a reputation as the foremost ecclesiastical architect of his day:

He designed something like 30 churches in Canterbury alone and about 10 more elsewhere in New Zealand.⁶

Although the gothic style was almost universally adopted by New Zealand's early ecclesiastical architects, all of Mountfort's churches are consistent in their full adoption of ecclesiological principles. In each of them the emphasis on the chancel shows his major concern with the celebration of the eucharist. The influence of Mount-

5 I. Lochhead to author, 2 Oct 1975. Mr Lochhead is an Art History Masters student engaged on a thesis on B. W. Mountfort.

fort's religious views on his architecture:

comes through in the richness of the decoration he applies to his churches, something that is not always apparent in the buildings themselves but which is apparent in some of his drawings. . . . Holy Trinity, Avonside is quite a good example of this . . . It (his religious views) also comes through in his concern with light, not only on the interior of his buildings, but also on the exterior where the play of light over the surface is an important consideration.⁷

Mountfort must be reckoned to be one of the founding fathers of Canterbury anglo catholicism. His churchmanship had a considerable impact on the designing of many churches in the diocese and his personal influence was largely responsible for the adoption of catholic ceremonial at Phillipstown.

The Church of the Good Shepherd soon gained many of the characteristics of an anglo catholic parish. The order of Sunday worship was as follows: 8am., holy communion; 10a.m., matins and the litany; 11a.m., sung eucharist, and 7 p.m., evensong. There was a surpliced choir. The ceremonial was in the sarum tradition, and by the 1920's had come to include gospel processions and incense. But more remarkable was the church's connection with the development of the religious life in Christchurch. In 1894 Sister Edith, who had founded the Deaconess Community of the Sisters of Bethany in the preceeding year, became the Phillipstown parish worker. In 1912 the Deaconess Community was renamed the Community of the Sacred Name. From 1894 onwards, Sisters of the

7 Ibid.

new religious community worked in Phillipstown as sunday school teachers and parish visitors. Requiem masses were celebrated in the Church of the Good Shepherd on the death of Mother Edith and Sister Mary Elice. Nor was this connection with the religious life without effect on the parishioners. Several women received a vocation to the religious life while living in the parish. Miss Francis was to become Sister Teresa of the Community of the Sacred Name. Miss Hilda Wickham was to become Sister Janetta of the Community of the Sisters of the Church, the order which founded St. Margaret's College.

Phillipstown's anglo catholicism was of a moderate unspectacular type which did not attract outside attention or provoke controversy. In this it reflected the outlook of its vicar. An example of Gilbert's low-key use of anglo catholic externals is that he wore a biretta not because it was a party badge, but because he was bald!.

In 1897 he suffered a heart attack and went on a trip to Britain to recuperate. During the holiday he kept a diary which records his impressions of the various types of religion he encountered. It also gives an accurate picture of his churchmanship. On the voyage out the ship stopped at Buenos Aires and Gilbert visited the city's roman catholic cathedral. He was entranced by the High Mass in progress:

The High Service was majestically rendered. I had never heard such music before. My whole soul was thrilled within me, and I felt an indescribable feeling of Holy Worship, and as the great organ and voices blended in one great sound of Praise and Thanksgiving I could not help feeling that Heaven had, for the moment, descended on

Earth.⁸

Later he visited another roman catholic cathedral, when the ship called at Santa Cruz:

Mass was being said at one of the altars when we entered, and I was glad of a few moments to bow before the Holy Sacrifice.⁹

The adoption of roman catholic terminology in describing the eucharist as a sacrifice was one of the more controversial articles of anglo catholic belief. In his native Cornwall, he visited the Church of St. Mary, Penzance, where he had been confirmed by Bishop Wilberforce in 1859:

There were Lights and Vestments, and all the adjuncts of High Ritual. I can't say that I liked it at all. It was too extreme for me. It struck me as being a very near approach (sic) Roman usage. I just looked in at St. Paul's Clarence St at 10.30 a.m., but soon saw there we had another extreme only of a Low type! And as you know I hate anything low.¹⁰

He returned to St. Mary's for the midday service and found the moderate ritual at this service more to his taste. In many of the churches Gilbert visited in Cornwall he found that zealous curates had altered the furniture and furnishings along catholic lines. At the church of his baptism in Perron he found that:

Outside and inside all is restored and made worthy of its heavenly

8 Typescript copy of Gilbert's journal, 12 June 1897, per Miss C. Gilbert.

9 Ibid., 6 July 1897.

10 Ibid., 25 July 1897.

Owner. The old square pews have made way for modern seats, where God's people can sit together as one family. Then the old arrangement for Parson and Clerk have given place to a beautiful Altar and Sanctuary - with all necessary Catholic Adornments.¹¹

Gilbert was delighted with these changes in church interiors.

It is, perhaps, significant that both of Canterbury's pioneer ritualist priests, Carlyon and Gilbert, were Cornishmen. In 1877 Cornwall had been detached from the diocese of Exeter to form the diocese of Truro. Truro was then, and still is, the most uncompromisingly anglo catholic diocese in the British Isles. Truro had few evangelical or middle of the road parishes. In consequence, Cornish religion has been polarized between staunch anglo catholicism and extreme methodism. Although Carlyon and Gilbert saw only the early days of all this, it is little wonder that men from such a strongly anglo catholic area would question the accepted practices in Canterbury.

For the six months that he was away Gilbert appointed a young English priest, the Reverend A.E. Hoggins, as his locum tenens. During the six month period Hoggins lost no time in introducing coloured vestments to Phillipstown. Little is known of Hoggins for shortly afterwards he was shifted from the parochial ministry to become the diocesan inspector of schools.

Gilbert returned from England in late 1897 and continued as vicar of Phillipstown for another two years. But his health continued to deteriorate and in 1899 he felt obliged to resign the incumbency of the parish.

11 Ibid., 31 July 1897.

He died shortly afterwards at the age of 53. Gilbert must have been an effective pastor and able administrator. The church had been opened free of debt which was a considerable achievement in what was a fairly poor parish. He left behind him a flourishing and active congregation.

The third vicar of Phillipstown was the Reverend H. E. Ensor. Surprisingly, Ensor had been ordained in the Nelson diocese, which has always been an evangelical stronghold. He was a mission priest in the Marlborough sounds, and vicar of Kaikoura for five years, before coming to Christchurch to take up the assistant curacy at St. Michael's.

His next appointment was to the parish of Leeston. Here he made the eucharist the focal point of parish worship and succeeded in substantially raising the numbers of communicants. Ensor completely redecorated the sanctuary by appealing to the aesthetic and domestic instincts of the ladies of the parish. Every issue of the Church News seemed to report a new altar frontal, a new fair linen cloth, or a new sanctuary carpet being produced by the faithful. The emphasis on worship and beauty was complimented by teaching. A "Catholic Religion" class was established, for young people. The congregation were told why the church needed all this interior decoration:

Our little church is beginning
to teach by the eye, as every
church in the land ought to teach.

The congregation received explicitly catholic teaching about the state of departed souls:

Thank God we who "believe in the
communion of saints" recognise
that though our loved ones are
hidden from our sight for a
while, they are only gone into
the ante-room of Heaven, and

that if we are faithful we shall
 join them there, and in God's good
 time go forward with them to the
 "Perfect vision of God." ¹²

After three years of vigorous work as vicar of Leeston, Ensor succeeded Gilbert at Phillipstown in 1899. His ministry at Leeston had shown him to be a moderate anglo catholic and this, no doubt, was why he was chosen for Phillipstown.

These were years of growth and expansion for the Church of the Good Shepherd. A parish report of 1901 noted that:

increased attendance at the services,
 an increase of over £600 in the
 offertories, and, above all, a large
 increase in the number of communions
 made, showed that the parish is in
 a healthy state, and that definite
 teaching and reverent ritual, instead
 of emptying the church, are filling
 it, and in the case of Phillipstown
 at least, with a congregation
 composed largely of men. ¹³

Consequently a great deal was achieved in this period. The vicarage was renovated in 1900 and in 1906 Ensor was able to extend the nave of the church and add the south transept. The installation of a large carved crucifix and the furnishing of the sanctuary was made possible by the generous gifts of a laity who were eager to promote the catholic furnishings of the church. Altar frontals and sanctuary hangings were among the gifts as well as the eucharistic vestments given by Mrs Gilbert in memory of her husband. The succeeding vicar added to the

12 C N, July 1897, p. 6.

13 C N, May 1901, p. 16.

vestment collection.

By now the parish was unmistakably anglo catholic and was producing some dedicated, even fanatical young men. One such young man was Fred Livingstone, a theological student at Christchurch College. In 1913 he travelled to England to apply to join the Society of the Sacred Mission at Kelham.¹⁴ From London he wrote an enthusiastic letter to a New Zealand friend recording his impressions of a tour of the prominent anglo catholic churches of the city:

it is wonderful to see the poor
dear ragged creatures coming in to
make their "Visit to the Blessed
Sacrament" Gren! all my sympathies
are with what the enemies call
"the extreme Ritualistic party."
Don't fear I can't help it and
I have not the slightest Roman
longing ... I see much more in
"Catholic prayers" now and many
other so called "extreme practices"
when I have seen the benefit they
are to the poor and what good they
do.

After enthusing over the quality and quantity of lace worn by priests and servers at St. Alban's, Holborn, Livingstone went into raptures over the incense:

Oh the smell of it, I can't ever
forget it. I'm in Paradise the
moment I scent it.¹⁵

Either because of war, or because he was turned down, Fred Livingstone did not get to Kelham. He was killed in action in 1918. He must have succumbed to the "Roman

14 Whether as a religious or theological student is not known.

15 Livingstone to unnamed N. Z. friend, 23 Apr 1913, Avonside parish papers.

longing" for he was buried with the full rites of the roman catholic church.

The Reverend H. E. Ensor would have disapproved of the extremism of his former parishioner. But for all that he was a decidedly anglo catholic churchman. He was well known for his ministry of healing and in 1908 Bishop Julius licensed him to investigate, with the aid of several Christchurch doctors, the theory and practice of therapeutic suggestion. Bishop Julius must have thought highly of him for in 1909 Ensor was made Arch-deacon of Akaroa. In 1917 he left Phillipstown to become the vicar of Hororata.

Phillipstown's fourth vicar was the Reverend C. A. Fraer. Ordained in the Dunedin diocese in 1896, he was to become the vicar of St. Stephen's, Tuahiwi in 1904. Fraer had a very successful ministry to the Maori people. His parish consisted of the Maori community of the Tuahiwi pa and the Maori - European community at Ohoka. Tuahiwi was not a pleasant place to live in. The Maori people in general were in a depressed state and a high T. B. mortality rate was carrying off many children of the pa. But Fraer's deep interest in the people won most of them over to an allegiance to the church. Parish life was active and firmly based on the catholic tradition. The eucharist was the focal point of parish worship with as many as 100 people turning out on good days. Records of parish patronal festivals list several male heads of families as being lay readers, acolytes, and thurifers. The parish church of St. Stephen's had a well furnished sanctuary and a complete set of eucharistic vestments. With a keen appreciation of the Maori love of communal gatherings Fraer introduced the primitive custom of the agape.¹⁶ After the eucharist the

16 The worship of the early christians was often accompanied by an agape or love feast, a fellowship meal in which the shared food was a symbol of the community's love for one another.

parishioners adjourned to the Whare Rununga to eat a fellowship meal together. Nor was the catholic tradition of the parish confined only to its worship. At the parish mission of 1911 many people made their first confession.

But Fraer's most enduring achievement was the founding of Te Waipounamu College at Ohoka in 1909. Te Waipounamu was established as a boarding school for Maori girls of the South and Chatham islands. Fraer saw its main purpose as being an evangelistic tool which would bring the best Christian influence to bear upon the womanhood and homes of the southern Maoris. It also arose out of his concern for the many handicaps facing the Maori people in their attempts to cope with European society. To this end the curriculum of the school included a religious, general and technical education. So eager was Fraer to promote the project that he turned over his Ohoka vicarage to the school and went to live at the Maori pa at Tuahiwi. Fraer was Te Waipounamu's chaplain and chairman of its council.

Thus when he moved to Phillipstown in 1917 he decided to bring the school with him. In 1920 the Te Waipounamu College moved to its present location in Ferry Rd. Fraer was to enjoy a long and fruitful ministry at Phillipstown which stretches beyond the period covered by this thesis. But his decision to move Te Waipounamu may have had far reaching effects on the church life of both Tuahiwi and Phillipstown. Tuahiwi ceased to be an independent parish in 1931 and was eventually placed under the pastoral care of Woodend. Ohoka became a part of the Kaiapoi parish. Perhaps with the school gone there seemed to be no reason for such a small community to have its own parish priest. Certainly since 1931 no anglican priest has resided at Tuahiwi and consequently the influence of the church on the community

there has diminished steadily throughout the century. Phillipstown had already had its heyday under Ensor. Fraer was to find that industry and business premises were gradually forcing residential dwellings out of the parish.

The most puzzling feature of Phillipstown's history is the lack of controversy over its pioneering of ritual developments in the diocese. More modest ritual innovations at Kaiapoi a few years earlier had caused a storm of opposition, while Phillipstown's adoption of catholic ceremonial passed almost unnoticed. Why was there no ritual case, no angry letters to the newspapers, no petitions of protest?

Part of the answer lies in the nature of the parish. Unlike Kaiapoi the laity welcomed, indeed demanded, the changes. What brought about Carlyon's downfall was a large body of intransigent low church parishioners. At Phillipstown the presence of a strongly anglo catholic lay element, led by Benjamin Mountfort, prevented any internal opposition calling attention to the nature of the changes in parish worship.

Later St. Michael's was to experience a similar change to ceremonial worship without internal opposition, but this change was to attract considerable controversy and external opposition. Phillipstown avoided this because of the different social background of the two parishes. St. Michael's was an inner city church which tended to draw upper middle class worshippers from the suburbs. It was a large and important parish with a prominent place in the life of the diocese. Moreover it had considerable prestige due to its historical status as the first anglican church in Christchurch and the original pro-cathedral. By contrast Phillipstown was a small, working class parochial district of fairly recent origin. It remained a parochial district and at no stage did it enjoy the status or independence of a

parish. Thus Phillipstown did not have the prominence or prestige to attract the attention of the militant low church party. Moreover, for many years it was the only parish of its kind and did not seem to represent a growing trend toward expansionist anglo catholicism. There was also a considerable contrast in the personalities of the respective innovating ritualist priests. Whereas Gilbert was a mild and moderate man, H. D. Burton of St. Michael's was an aggressive mission priest with a reputation for fiery preaching.

There had also been a change of personality in the hierarchy of the church. In 1890 Churchill Julius became the second Bishop of Christchurch. Bishop Julius was of a moderate evangelical background but was very tolerant of anglo catholics and became higher and higher as his episcopate went on. An old parishioner thinks that he had a soft spot for Phillipstown.¹⁷

Moreover New Zealand colonial society had changed. Life was settled enough for Canterbury settlers to move beyond the utilitarian considerations of a frontier society. As life became more stable and prosperous more attention was paid to the decorative adjuncts of european civilization, and its associated cluttered Victorian drawing rooms. With this came an increasing appreciation of the aesthetic possibilities of clerical dress and posture.

New Zealand church life was also changing. There was a growing awareness of the impact of anglo catholicism on the Church in England. A number of developments within the diocese had created an increasing acceptance and tolerance of the new movement.¹⁸ Even before the Carlyon case, Bishop Harper's rulings on the acceptable mode of introducing changes in worship and laid the way

17 Interview, Horace Palmer, 20 Sept 1974.

18 These new developments are the subject of the next chapter.

open for pluralism in worship. While there is no record of Gilbert seeking the bishop's sanction of ceremonial innovations there was certainly complete unanimity between parson and parish in desiring them. Certainly the changes were of a more extreme nature than those envisaged by Bishop Harper but from the moment he authorised a procedure for a parish to change its worship patterns it became almost certain that some would do so. This growing congregationalism in worship was part of a world wide anglican trend.¹⁹

Thus, by the turn of the century the foundations of an anglo catholic tradition had been laid in the diocese of Christchurch.

19 Ref. pp. 13, 71-72

CHAPTER VI

ST. MICHAEL'S

In the period 1900 to 1914, the catholic movement gathered strength in the Christchurch diocese. Anglo catholicism made some spectacular gains in the teeth of considerable opposition. The diocese of Christchurch changed from being fairly uniformly low church to relatively tolerant of anglo catholics, though not anglo catholic itself. The central achievement of the revival was its capture of St. Michael's in 1910. However as a preface to a discussion of St. Michael's, it is necessary to examine three factors which prepared the way for the anglo catholic revival.

The first factor was the establishment of the religious life in Christchurch. In 1879 the Christchurch diocesan synod urged that enquiries be made regarding the possibility of establishing a female religious community in the city. Bishop Harper was especially keen to establish a deaconess community in order to meet the social problems of Christchurch. In his presidential address to the 1882 synod he referred to a request that he consider the founding of a community. He declared such an order to be justified by new testament precedents and extremely necessary in meeting the social problems of the young colony. However he doubted that the time had come to establish religious communities in the diocese because there were not sufficient resources to support them and because it was not possible to obtain the services of an experienced deaconess from Britain to supervise the beginnings of the project.

This unsatisfactory state of affairs continued for the next eleven years. Even deputations by Bishop Julius to Archbishop Temple proved fruitless for the archbishop maintained that before a community could be established it was necessary for there to be more than one wanting the religious life. He had not realised, however, that there were others, including two ordained deaconesses waiting. Archbishop Temple selected Sister Edith of St. Andrew's Community, who was to be the foundress of the religious life in Christchurch.

It is significant that Bishop Julius decided to use a deaconess community to establish this life in Christchurch. The development of anglican sisterhoods in England had aroused considerable opposition from those who feared that the communities would romanize the English church. Bishop Julius knew that any such innovation would be bound to arouse similar suspicion among members of his low church diocese. In the English controversy about the role of women in the church, two spheres of female service had been promoted and each had a different justification. The anglo catholics advocated stable communities of single women living a common life devoted to prayer and works of mercy. They sought to legitimate these sisterhoods by referring to precedents in the early church. The evangelicals wished to see the deaconess order revived to carry out the welfare and chaperoning functions which had been theirs in the scriptural church. The evangelical proposal had the advantage that the deaconess order was the only existing ordained ministry for women to which they were admitted by episcopal imposition of hands. It was sought on the one hand by anglo catholics to justify sisterhoods, and on the other by evangelicals to justify deaconesses, on the utilitarian grounds that they would reinforce the parish system in large towns and help relieve social distress without

calling for a substantial increase in financial support. In some cases English anglo catholics sought to remove the objections to sisterhoods-by combining the two roles in deaconess communities. It was from just such a community, namely the St. Andrew's Deaconess Community, that Sister Edith came and it was by this means that Bishop Julius hoped to infiltrate the religious life into his diocese.

When Bishop Julius brought Sister Edith back with him, some Christchurch people looked upon the new arrival as a "Popish female." However the bishop had a ready defence against the critics in that the English evangelicals supported deaconesses: they were regarded as the cheapest and most effective means of relieving social distress, and he could claim that a deaconess community was necessary for mutual support. He did not plainly state that he was intent on founding a Christchurch sisterhood. In his presidential address to the 1893 synod Bishop Julius said:

I am convinced that the office of deaconess can only be adequately fulfilled when associated with community life and I propose to form such a community in Christchurch, gradually and carefully increasing the number of deaconesses and associating with the community all such women as desire training in teaching, district visiting, the nursing of the sick, and other such offices as women are so well qualified to fulfill.¹

Sister Edith became Mother Edith of the Deaconess Community of the Sisters of Bethany. She was aware of the

1 CN, Nov 1893, p. 10.

continuing suspicions of some Christchurch anglicans. When the Community house in St. Asaph St. was dedicated in 1895, Mother Edith wrote:

The inmates of the Home are not nuns,
neither are they salaried workers...

At present there are three deaconesses,
four associates, and three probationers
connected with the institution.

She listed extensively the useful work of the community members. Some were parish workers, some teachers, some nursed the poor, sick, and chronic cases who could not be taken care of by institutions. Others were engaged in rescue work and religious instruction. Mother Edith carefully explained that deaconesses could not work in a parish without the consent of the vicar and the bishop, that they did not wish to take away the living of the professional nurses, and that:

they give freely what they can,
and all they expect in return is
a mere subsistence.²

It was this varied and difficult work which won over the support of more and more Christchurch people. As time went on, the community grew in number although there was a steady decline in the number of deaconesses ordained. In 1900 the St. Asaph St. House had to be enlarged and by 1910 it housed ten sisters and fourteen associates. In 1912 the community moved into its present permanent house in Barbadoes St. In that year the community formally changed from being a deaconess community to a religious order exclusively, by renaming itself the Community of the Sacred Name. One of the early sisters makes the position quite clear when she writes:

2 Dedication of Community House, 28 Feb 1895, DCSB pamphlet.

From the beginning the Community was a Religious Order and its members were Professed Sisters. For some years they were ordained Deaconesses but on account of the uncertain and unsatisfactory position of this Office in the Church, it was decided that no more Sisters would be ordained. The last two were ordained in May 1914.³

By 1919 the Community conducted a daily eucharist and the seven-fold office. After the dramatic change in churchmanship at St. Michael's, its vicars became frequent visitors to the Community House. That a religious order could establish itself in a low church colonial diocese without opposition is a tribute to the diplomacy of both Bishop Julius and Mother Edith. The Community of the Sacred Name is both a foundation stone and a monument to the anglo catholic tradition. The Community gained acceptance and recognition through the quality of its religious and social work. As at Phillipstown, the influence of its spirituality and practical work did much to make anglo catholicism understandable and acceptable to Christchurch anglicans.

Nor were they the only form of anglican religious life in Christchurch at the time. The Sisters of the Church with their mother house at Kelburn, England, had charge of St. Margaret's College from 1910 to 1930. Sister Blanche and Sister Winifred were the first sisters to come out and they were later joined by others. The sisters were obliged to withdraw from New Zealand in 1930 as they were needed in other branch houses. Canon Cecil

3 Extract from Sister Constance, CSN, to author, 16 July 1975.

Mutter, a former curate at St. Michael's who had spent some time in America, was instrumental in bringing out sisters from the Order of St Anne to New Zealand in 1920. Four sisters from Arlington Heights, Boston, came from America in January 1920 and had charge of St Anne's home at Styx, and later in Papanui. Here they carried out preventive and rescue work. The Sisters of St. Anne returned to America in 1923-24 and the Community of the Sacred Name took over their work.

The second development which changed public attitudes to anglo catholicism was the 1910 General Mission of Help. In 1906 the Wellington diocese called for a General Mission in which a large team of English missionaries would work their way through every diocese of New Zealand. The New Zealand church was becoming vaguely aware that its church-going population was on the wane. The other dioceses enthusiastically took up the project. In 1910 sixteen missionaries came to New Zealand under commission from the Archbishops of Canterbury and York. From the start the promoters of the General Mission were anxious to keep a balance between High and Low, and to make their aim quite clear:

We wish it to be clearly understood that we have never regarded this Mission as being an effort on the part of a pious England to convert the wicked and pagan colonials... The leader of the Mission, Canon E. A. Stuart, is a leader well known in "Evangelical" Church circles. A great missionary and a fearless speaker, who has clearly made a reputation in South Africa and in the Pan Anglican Congress, and who in spite of his pronounced Evangelical views, is heartily respected and beloved by

"High" Churchmen.

His brother, Canon H. V. Stuart is Rector of the very important manufacturing town of Stoke-upon-Trent. Other members of the team include: Canon Tupper Carey the popular fisherman's parson ... Canon Lillington is vicar ... of Hull and one of the best known men of the Evangelical school of thought. Mr Horam has been a naval officer...

Mr Fitzgerald and Mr Rees, who belong to the Community of the Mission of Preachers at Mirfield, are both men who have given up their lives to the particular work of mission preaching ... Canon Ivens, a well known Evangelical preacher, has a wide experience of the hard-headed and democratic working people of the West Riding of Yorkshire, who are so like New Zealanders in their views and ideals.

Mr Cyril Hephner is ... a popular missionary in the North of England. Mr de Carteret ... is prominent among supporters of C. M. S.

Mr Kinloch, who is private chaplain to the Duke of Westminster, and Rector ... at Eaton Hall ...

Mr Farrar, Vicar of Bridgeport, has lived in New Zealand ...

Mr Evans has been Curate to Canon T. Carey. Mr Darby has been chosen by the Bishop of Worcester ...

Mr Bell is lecturer for the Church of England Temperance Society in the Oxford Diocese ... he comes to us on this occasion not as a temperance preacher, but as a missionary.

Mr Jones has experience of work in a small country parish near Malvern ...

The committee has tried most sincerely to send men who represent all shades of thought within the Church of England, with no thought whatever of forwarding any narrow or sectioned interest.⁴

The missionaries were supposed to be sent to parishes where they would be acceptable. Thus the anglo catholics were generally sent to parishes which would not object to their brand of churchmanship. Interestingly enough, in Christchurch, the Mirfield Fathers were not sent to parishes which one would think of as having an anglo catholic tradition. Father J. C. Fitzgerald went to St. Luke's while Father T. Rees conducted missions at Lyttelton and Leeston. St Michael's mission was run by its new vicar, the Rev. H. J. Burton (a successful missionary in his own right), while Phillipstown received the Rev. H. W. Jones. The Mirfield Fathers had been chosen wisely for a mission which was designed not to give offence ...

Tim Rees ... deepened our spiritual outlook and (was) a safe, sane Catholic. Mirfield was like that-down to earth.⁵

From the ritualist era on, anglo catholicism had

4 CN, Oct 1910, p.8.

5 Interview with Canon A. Williams, quoted in D. G. S. Rathgen, "The Church in New Zealand 1890-1920, with special reference to W. A. Orange" (unpublished thesis).

exhibited evangelical traits in its methods of conducting missions. A Saturday night procession of witness, with crucifer, acolytes, and surpliced clergy, called the people to a mission service. This service consisted of emotional hymns, a rousing call to repentance, and extempore prayer. This formula was commonly employed in many English slum parishes. Indeed, anglo catholics such as the Cowley Fathers

were the organisers and tacticians of Anglican parish mission. Right up to the present day the kind of evangelism worked out during the period has remained a typical feature of Anglican church life.⁶

Although the 1910 Mission of Help was not an anglo catholic project, its form and methods were the direct outcome of anglo-catholic evangelicalism in the English Victorian church. Many features of the mission in Christchurch seem more typical of a ritualist slum parish than a low church colonial diocese. One former St. Luke's parishioner remembers a procession of witness consisting of crucifer, choir, clergy and people, which went around the streets of the parish singing hymns. At each street the vicar would stop the procession and sing the collect for revival. These processions were held throughout Christchurch and were by no means confined only to those parishes visited by the Mirfield Fathers.

There were those who thought the mission an anglo catholic conspiracy:

THE GENERAL MISSION KILLED BY RITUALISTS...

That there were evangelical and good men and able preachers in this General Mission cannot be questioned, but why were they not all of this type? ...

6 O. Voll, Catholic Evangelicalism, p. 133.

What a pity that, as pointed out at the time of their coming by the New Zealand Churchman, three of them should belong to the "Confraternity of the Blessed Sacrament", a secret society founded to teach the real presence, in the eucharistic sacrifice; that three of them should be members of the "Christian Union" which aims at corporate union with Rome; that six of them should believe in the mixed chalice; that two should burn incense; that four should wear mass vestments; that seven should use altar lights; and that seven should adopt the eastward position in the ante communion service. It seemed to be a Ritualistic mission with a small evangelical section for a cover.⁷

The writer went on to quote the shocked reaction of evangelical protestants who had attended the mission services and who alleged that the missionaries drilled romish doctrines into the congregations. It was this type of opinion that cause Bishop Julius to refer to church party strife in his presidential address to the 1910 synod:

That obstacles should arise in the progress of a mission is not surprising. A mission is a direct attack upon "the palace of a strong man armed" and he will surely fight for his own possessions. But a church divided against itself can do nothing. The man or a body of men who deliberately set themselves

7 J. Dickson, Shall Ritualism and Romanism capture N.Z.,

to stir up strife are, with whatever good intentions, playing into the hands of the devil. The Church of the whole Province is united in support of the mission. The Missioners, by no means of one type of Churchmanship, are yet content to work together for the conversion of souls. These considerations ought to be sufficient to deter any loyal member of the church from letting loose upon her, at such a time as this, the abominations born of party-strife and self will.⁸

The Mission had a considerable impact, all the mission services being crowded. In the sense that the parochial mission was the product of anglo catholic evangelicalism, the General Mission can be said to have presented the people of Christchurch with what may be fairly described as another anglo catholic institution. But more than this:

The Mission marks that point at which we may say the New Zealand Church was officially tolerant of more than one (i.e. "Low" or Evangelical) opinion; the "High" Churchmen had been accepted.⁹

Father Fitzgerald and Father Rees made quite an impression on many people and through their preaching and their "Mirfield Manuals" they were able to expound anglo catholic ideas to a wide audience. The extent of their influence can be gauged from an article in the Church News entitled:

8 CN, Dec 1910, Synod appendix, p. 18.

9 Rathgen, p. 97.

THE COMMUNITY OF THE RESURRECTION.

The Church in New Zealand already owes a considerable debt to this young and vigorous community. Two of its members, Fr. Fitzgerald and Fr Rees won greatful remembrance from all who came under their influence in the General Mission ... The Vicar of Ross, (The Reverend A. F. Wallace) who has just joined the ranks of our clergy, is a priest trained at the College of the Resurrection ...

We have branches of the Fraternity (of the Resurrection) in the chief cities of New Zealand. The Associate (of the fraternity) undertakes to:

(1) Pray regularly for the Community and the Fraternity.

(2) Subscribe to their work at least 1s a year;

(3) Interest others in the special aims of the community, viz

(a) the revival of the religious life.

(b) mission work at home and abroad.

(c) the supply and training of clergy.¹⁰

It was the churchmanship and opinions of Bishop Julius which formed a third influence in the emergence of anglo catholicism. Julius had been brought up in a staunch evangelical family. His father had been President of the Church Association, the society which prosecuted ritualist clergy. As a student at Oxford, Julius moved in evangelical circles. He listened with interest to the sermons of distinguished tractarians such

10 CN, 1 Feb 1912, p. 17.

as Pusey and Liddon, but emerged from Oxford with firm evangelical convictions. But even as a young clergyman he was no inflexible partyman. When curate of Brent Knoll in Somerset, he succeeded in bringing two nuns into the parish to nurse the sick during a typhoid epidemic, despite the objections of his vicar to these "Popish females". This incident probably led to his determination to found the Community of the Sacred Name in Christchurch. In 1878 he became vicar of Holy Trinity, Islington, a large slum parish in the east of London. Islington was also the central stronghold of evangelicism in the Church of England. His appointment was looked upon with suspicion by many who did not accept Julius as a "true - blue evangelical". A storm of opposition broke out when Julius announced on his first Easter morning that in future he would refrain from wearing the black Geneva gown in favour of the surplice. Here indeed was a "liberal" evangelical. Later he became Archdeacon of Ballarat, Australia, and it was from here in 1889 that he received the call to the Bishopric of Christchurch. A journalist writing for the New Zealand Press Association in Ballarat asked Julius:

How would you describe your Church tendencies, Archdeacon? Well I should say they were of the Broad Church, although, of course, different people have different opinions. Some might consider I was too much inclined to the High Church, and others might take quite an opposite opinion.¹¹

His sympathies inclined to liberal catholicism. After a trip to England in 1893, he told the Christchurch

11 Weekly Press, 11 Oct 1889, quoted in G.F.L. and A.C. Elworthy, A Power in the Land, p. 240.

Synod that:

The extreme Evangelicals were not doing much, nor were the extreme Ritualists, but there was another school arising, full of hope and promise, represented by such men as Paget and Gore who were in full sympathy with old Catholic teaching, but in full sympathy at the same time with modern thought and democracy.¹²

Some were to find the churchmanship of Bishop Julius too "broad". In 1894 he defended the doctrine of praying for the dead when preaching a funeral sermon on the death of Bishop Harper. The subject was causing some controversy in the English church at the time and the bishop's sermon made prayers for the dead a much discussed question in the Christchurch papers and elsewhere. As the turn of the century approached, Bishop Julius felt it necessary to explain why the English ritual controversies were taking place and to prepare his people for their possible spread to his diocese. Explaining the causes of the ritual conflict to the 1899 synod, he said:

The ritual is attacked because of the doctrine which under lies it.

He went on to explain the slackness and torpor of much anglican church life which had made the Oxford Movement necessary. He added a cautionary note:

You will not suppose that, because I rejoice in the movement itself, I therefore approve of the excesses which have marked its progress ...

¹² Elworthy, p. 240.

Suffer me, in conclusion, to suggest a few words of counsel.

1. We in the Colonies have felt too little of the forces of this new life (of the Oxford movement). There is no extreme ritual anywhere in New Zealand; but for the most part our churches are comely, our services reverent and decent, and the sacraments are frequently ministered ... If there were but one word which I might say to you today, it would be PRAY ...

2. Take care that you do not lose the evangelical spirit of true religion, that your services and teaching reveal Christ, and do not hide him ...

3. Remember that is is quite as easy, and equally harmful, to sin by way of defeat, as it is by way of excess. Remember that the clergy who neglect the Church's rule of Daily Prayers, and mutilate her services, have no right to cry out against their brethren.¹³

A visit to England in 1905 clarified the Bishop's thinking on a problem which would eventually face him in Christchurch. On his return he was interviewed by a reporter of the Christchurch Press who suggested that the English bishops did not appear to be unanimous in their attitude towards ritualism. The bishop agreed and said that he would be sorry to see such rigid uniformity. The modern church required a certain amount (sic) of licence and liberty to make it a live church. Obviously Bishop Julius had studied the findings of the Royal

13 C C, Jan 1899, pp. 7-9.

Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline with close attention.

It seems clear that Bishop Julius had a mixture of catholic and evangelical traits in his religion. He was not interested in vestments for their own sake but liked things done decently and in order. He wore a cope and mitre at St. Michael's out of respect for their tradition, but nowhere else. He had a capable, well informed mind and disliked a fussy, unrealistic religion which did not relate to the problems of modern life. Hence his appreciation of liberal catholicism. Above all he was realistic about the problems associated with ritualism and appreciative of the contributions made by the Oxford Movement. He was an ideal bishop to encourage and protect the emergence of anglo catholicism in the diocese of Christchurch.

The decisive change at St. Michael's came in 1910. St. Michael's has always been one of the oldest and most important congregations of the New Zealand anglican church, particularly as it is the Mother church of the Christchurch diocese. Since 1894, its vicar had been the Reverend Walter Averill, an exceptional priest and a very good preacher. He was not a high churchman though he had been influenced by the liberal catholicism of Gore and Paget. The parish was still predominantly residential, although many well-to-do worshippers were drawn from the suburbs. The congregation was large and well organised. In 1909 Averill was elected Bishop of Waiapu. The St. Michael's nominators delegated their right to nominate to the Bishop of London, Dr A.F. Winnington-Ingram and Canon Newbolt. Both were anglo catholics. Bishop Julius presided at a special meeting of the vestry at which he announced that the vacant cure had been offered to the Reverend Harry Darwin Burton, who had accepted it.

For the past eighteen years, Burton had been the

Diocesan Missioner in the diocese of St. Albans. In that time he had arranged over a hundred parochial ten-day missions, and had conducted no fewer than forty-two of them himself. He was a staunch anglo catholic, a renowned preacher, and had a powerful personality.

It must be asked why the St. Michael's nominators delegated their choice to two well-known anglo catholic sympathizers and why they accepted the nomination of such an outstanding anglo catholic missionary. It would seem that the vestry made a conscious decision to go High because of declining church attendances. Looking at the communicant figures for the Trinity season (the longest season in the church's year) we see that in 1905 there were 3068 communicants over 25 Sundays which meant an average of 118 communicants a Sunday. In that year there were 539 Easter Sunday communicants. In 1908 there were 2590 communicants over 23 Sundays, an average of 108 communicants. There were 511 Easter Sunday communicants in the same year. It is plausible to suggest that the vestry, worried by these declining figures, thought that a vicar with a flair for parochial missions and a different style of churchmanship would remedy the situation.

The appointment was not unnoticed by New Zealand apponents of anglo catholicism:

As soon as news of the choice reached New Zealand a leaflet was circulated in the South Island intimating, on the authority of "The English Churchman", that the vicar appointed was an advanced Ritualist, whose extreme teaching was the subject of a question in the House of Lords by the Earl of Portsmouth, that he had introduced incense into St. Saviour's church, St. Albans, and that in New Zealand they might expect him to mean

business. It was rumoured at the same time that Parish nominators of St. James's Sydney, had nominated him in vain as a priest who met their ritualist liking. He was reported also to be a member of "The English Church Union" which has made corporate union with Rome one of the chief planks in its platform. There were many protests and quite a flutter in the Anglican dovecot at Christchurch. In vain. The appointment was confirmed by the local bishop and the new vicar was duly instituted at St. Michael's. At his (sic) consecration the Bishop eulogised his "straightforwardness and honesty," asserted that there was "room for variety and spaciousness in the house of God," and intimated that he did not want a "man bound hand and foot by the precedents of custom" ... The troublers of Israel he thought had been indulging in "misrepresentation, slander, and anonymous abuse," which would not turn either him or the vicar from the path of duty.¹⁴

From the very first day that he arrived, Father Burton introduced vestments and the daily mass. His ceremonial innovations were modest by English standards and included taking the eastwards position before the altar, the sign of the cross at the absolution, bowing at the name of Jesus and the wearing of eucharistic vestments, including copes. However these were major changes for the people of St. Michael's. Some did leave, but it is remarkable how many accepted the changes and stayed. Numbers did drop but the figures

indicate that this was partly due to the declining trend noted before, rather than a widespread reaction against the new ceremonial practices. For instance, in 1910, the inter-regnum year, the average Trinity Sunday communicant figure was 81 with 470 Easter communicants. In 1912 with Burton fully in the saddle, numbers dropped slightly to a Trinity Sunday average of 77 communicants, with 362 Easter Sunday communicants. The communicant figures were more pessimistic than the reality of the situation. St. Michael's was packed for the evening services as many people came from near and far to hear the renowned preacher or simply to see what was going on. It must also be remembered that anglo catholic priests were very strict about their parishioners fasting and going to confession before receiving communion. The main service of the day was sung mass at 11a.m., and some people received communion at their local parish church before going on to St. Michael's.

The vestry minutes record only one piece of opposition to Father Burton. Vestryman M. C. Orbell moved:

That this Vestry desires to place upon record its disapproval of the innovations introduced into the Communion service at St. Michael's which are disconcerting to a great majority of parishioners and hopes that the Vicar may see his way to revert to the method of conducting the service so long in use and so dear to the congregation.¹⁵

The motion was carried with the people's churchwarden dissenting. The motion does not seem to have had any effect on Burton, for on 13 March 1911, Orbell resigned from the vestry without any ado. Burton seems to have maintained a firm control over the vestry for he encountered no further obstacles in his innovations. In May 1912 the vicar and the vestry unanimously agreed to make the 11a.m. sung mass the main Sunday service.

There was a similar lack of controversy three years later when the vestry quietly agreed to the perpetual reservation of the blessed sacrament at St. Michael's.

It is difficult to understand the profound impact Burton had on St. Michael's without knowing something of his personality. An English priest recalls him thus:

Canon Burton was Vicar of St. John's Burgess Hill, during my teens. He was what I, would describe as an "old warhorse" of the Catholic movement ... In the Vicarage is you were in trouble he was kindness itself, and one could not help loving him ... He told me always to use the Prayer Book (but this was somewhat generously interpreted in his mind, because he always said the Roman Canon - with a certain vigour). He was a good confessor and most gentle with us. I can remember his preaching a lot on going to Mass. There was always a special emphasis on that word Mass ... I remember asking him if he would use a censer if I collected the money for it, and presented it to the church. He agreed, and when some Protestant shopkeeper objected he told him that he did not go into a shop objecting to the things he had in his shop window and he could "go and suck eggs" or whatever one said in those days! ...

The Canon was of course a great preacher. This was his forte. He would thunder from the pulpit, and I imagine his colourful character and the oratory of which he was capable,

together with his warm heart under his gruff exterior and his unwavering convictions of which there was absolutely no doubt, drew people to the faith.

I would not have described him as a great scholar. He was certainly a great missionary and I know no one like him in these days ... I believe he thought a lot of Gore and Co.¹⁶

Opposition to Burton's changes came from outside the parish in 1911. The Lyttelton Times reported "There is still a great deal of feeling amongst members of the Church of England in Christchurch in regard to ritualistic practices at St. Michael's and a memorial of protest signed by 860 members of the Church of England, has been presented to Bishop Julius, who has replied stating that he does not intend to discuss the law of the church in regard to ritual at the present time, but will do so in his address to the diocesan synod in September. The memorialists said in part:

We ... respectfully desire to draw your Lordship's attention to the fact that ritualistic practices which are obnoxious to us and to a great many other members of our church, have been introduced into at least one parish in the diocese; and from what we have learned we are afraid that such practices are likely to be introduced into other parishes, even if such is not already the case.

16 Father A. Simmons to author, 29 June, 1975, Fr Simmons is vicar of St. Benedict's, Aldershot West, England.

It is unnecessary we think at present to go into details as to these practices as your Lordship is fully aware of their nature, but we might mention such things as the wearing of mass vestments, the use of wafers, the elevation and adoration of the elements, prostrations, etc, which practices are inseparably bound up with doctrinal teaching, which, in our opinion, is not in accordance with the Book of Common Prayer.

We venture to remind your Lordship that for similar practices a clergyman of the Church of England in this diocese was tried by the Bishops of this Province some thirty-four years ago and was proved guilty and relieved of his cure.

The memorialist's spokesman was the former St. Michael's vestryman, M. C. Orbell, who went on to point out that some of St. Michael's oldest parishioners had ceased attending because of their distress at the new ritualistic practices. He said that the memorialists had no intention of laying charges against any clergyman at that time, and that they hoped that the bishop would restore harmony at St. Michael's by suppressing the ritualistic practices.

In a preliminary reply, Bishop Julius recognised with pleasure the moderate tone of the Memorial. He continued:

- (1) That it will be my earnest endeavour ... to secure such general obedience to the laws of the Church, and the formularies of the Book of

Common Prayer, as may be possible under altered conditions of time and circumstance.

- (2) That the rubrics of the Book of Common Prayer allow, and were intended to allow, a wide divergence of ritual, and that I am not aware of any ritualistic practices in the Church of St. Michael and All Angels, Christchurch, contrary to a reasonable and lawful interpretation of the same ...
- (4) That ... I think it significant that neither the outgoing nor present churchwardens have signed the memorial and that is signed by no more than three members of the late vestry and one of the present.
- (5) That, while I am in no way prepared to demand an undue deference on the part of the clergy to local custom, as distinct from the wider law of the church, I depreciate the introduction at anytime of a ritual to which the people are not accustomed, without careful teaching and preparation, and the most kindly consideration of the habits of worship, the prejudices and convictions of such parishioners, as are able to understand, enjoy or accept it.¹⁷

The eagerly awaited reply in synod came two months later.

The main part of the bishop's presidential address to the 1911 diocesan synod was a lucid and scholarly

17 LT, 1 Jul 1911, p.7.

exposition of the problems of ritualism. After his preliminary remarks, he went directly to the nub of the problem:

But the question before us now in regard to the practices specified in the Memorial is ... whether they are inseparably associated with doctrines which are not in accordance with the teaching of our church; and whether the practices themselves are unlawful to be used in the Church of England.

He then went on to point out that the anglican church shared with the roman catholic church a common belief in the eucharistic sacrifice and the real presence of Christ in the sacrament. Both churches explained and expressed them differently but both believed in the two doctrines. The church had adopted eucharistic vestments to signify its belief in the eucharistic sacrifice and the real presence. The memorialists had missed the point by calling them "mass vestments" since vestments had been used many centuries earlier than the doctrine of transubstantiation and its attendant medieval corruptions. In a closely argued historical analysis of the rubric on ornaments in the Book of Common Prayer, Bishop Julius declared that:

... The law of the Church of England in regards to Vestments has been unchanged and that their use is not only lawful but enjoined.

During the sixteenth century, the strength of the Puritan party had led to the widespread abandonment of vestments. More than this, the holy communion had ceased to be the church's central act of worship. Thus the custom of the last three centuries was nothing to be proud of, for it had frustrated the intentions of the reformers. It was true that the Privy Council had

twice declared the use of vestments to be illegal, but:

The decisions of the Privy Council in Ecclesiastical matters made since the Constitution of the Church of this province in 1857 are not binding upon us in New Zealand ... It must also be remembered that the acts of uniformity are not in force in this country, and that the King's Ecclesiastical law does not run in the Colonies. To sum up our enquiry; --- It appears that Vestments are ordered to be used under the Law of the Prayer Book, by which alone we are governed and controlled in such matters; that this view of the law obtained very widely at the time when our constitution was formed; and that the only courts to which we Churchmen can appeal in the matter, are our own Church Courts, duly constituted.

It is not often that inconsistency strengthens any man's position; and yet it may be that my explanation of the law on this subject gains additional weight from the fact that I have not obeyed it... After nearly forty years' service in the Ministry of the Church, it is difficult to change the use to which I have become accustomed. It is perhaps this feeling which gives me the greater sympathy with those laity of the Church who are in the like position. As a Parish Priest, I should certainly refuse to make any attempt to force the rule of the Ornaments Rubric upon an unprepared

and reluctant congregation.

Referring to specific matters mentioned in the memorial the bishop declared that both wafer bread and ordinary bread were allowed in the communion service by the relevant rubric. Speaking of the elevation of the eucharistic elements, Bishop Julius ruled that in accordance with primitive and patristic practice it was legitimate to elevate the holy bread so as to present the memorial of the diving sacrifice before God. However elevation before the people for the purpose of adoration was unknown to the early church and expressly forbidden by the thirty-nine articles. In conclusion Bishop Julius stated:

I ask you to bear in mind, that under our Canons, the Bishop who is denied any voice in the appointment of Pastors, has absolute authority in the matter of discipline ...

I am not asking for more than the church has given me, when I beg you to leave these matters in my hands. The Prayer Book requires you to refer such questions to the Ordinary. I have never known any good whatever come of ritual trials. I know that they give abundant cause for the enemy to blaspheme. I believe that my clergy will loyally accept and obey the ruling of their Bishop; and I do not think that the laity have any reason to doubt my sincerity, or question my love of justice. I have never failed, so far as I know, of sympathy with men who differ from me; God helping me, neither

Evangelical nor High Church men,
faithfully doing God's work, shall
ever suffer at my hands.¹⁸

The bishop's address was not entirely well received:

Mr F. Ferryman said that if the
motion (to publish the President's
address in Church News) was carried
he hoped the address would be read
in conjunction with the finding of
(the) five Bishops.¹⁹

That finding was in direct opposition to
the position taken up by the President's
address. The bench of Bishops forbade
the clergy to abstain from the use of
unleavened bread, and also laid down
rules as to the way in which the cele-
brant priest should stand. Under
these circumstances what were the
poor laymen to do?

Do as I tell you.

But it's a case of one against five,
my Lord.

The resolution was carried.²⁰

The events at St. Michael's were not the only signs
of a change of attitude towards anglo catholicism. Since
the turn of the century the movement had influenced other
parochial clergy in less spectacular ways. In 1896
The Rev. Airey Watson had become the vicar of St. Mary's
Merivale. In 1902 a confused and bitter wrangle broke
out between Watson and a group of his parishioners.
Some of the parishioners felt that the vicar had been

18 CN, Oct 1911, synod supplement.

19 Unidentified.

20 LT, 7 Sept 1911, p. 10.

negligent in his duties, and that as a result, church attendances were falling. There would also seem to have been an under current of dissatisfaction in matters of doctrines and ceremonies. Watson was thought to be a high churchman, though his churchmanship was probably quite unexceptional in comparison with that of the clergy of Phillipstown and St. Michael's. The records of the dispute are not clear on this point, although Watson did refer to it explicitly in his speech of resignation in 1903:

The more serious matter is with regard to the increased ritual in public worship, some regarding this as a step towards Rome, they having an unreasoning horror of anything Rome did ... Rome, in her wisdom, recognized that God made the eye as well as the ear and the heart. To many, beauty of worship suggests beauty of Holiness, beauty of repentance and beauty of service.²¹

The Rev. C. H. Gossett, a militant low churchman, was then nominated to the cure of the parish.

The Church News had changed its opinions of anglo catholicism since the days of its die - hard opposition to Carlyon. An editorial in 1910 declared that;

The question of vestments is upon us. Whether we like it or not, it is come and we shall never again be able to go on in our old uniform way in this diocese - The way, we mean, of all wearing the same dress and presenting much the same appearance to the

21 E. Brathwaite, The House built upon a Rock, pp.17-18.

eye of the worshipper. There will now be different uses in our churches - some exhibiting the cope or chasuble, others keeping to the simple surplice with which our Fathers and ourselves have up to now been familiar as the ecclesiastical garment of the English Church ... Could they (vestments) only be kept simple in form and white (or at least quiet in colour); could it be well understood that they do not of themselves stand for Roman and false doctrines; then the whole matter might be left to adjust itself according to individual taste and good feeling in each parish. If they mean Romanism we won't have them; if they mean Mediaevalism we don't want them; but if they are going to carry us back to the Master Himself and to the Feast of Love ... then we would not only tolerate them - we would welcome them from the heart.²²

The curate of Holy Trinity Avonside in 1913 was the Reverend H. C. Money. This deacon was an anglo catholic with a devotion to the principles of christian socialism. Towards the end of 1913, New Zealand experienced a waterfront strike of considerable proportions. Money's sympathies lay with the strikers to such an extent that he went to Lyttelton and addressed the watersiders urging them to continue to demand redress for their grievances. He was priested in Lent 1914,

22 CN, Sept 1910, p.1.

and shortly afterwards left for England to join the Community of the Resurrection at Mirfield. The vicar wrote of his radical curate:

We may not all agree with Mr Money's ideas, but at any rate he has the courage of his opinions and is thoroughly in earnest.²³

Some influential sections of the parish were glad to see the back of this socialist curate. It is clear that New Zealanders would have nothing to do with the christian socialism which was such an important part of liberal catholicism. Anglo catholic nuns were allowed to carry out social work but the movement was prevented from developing a full social gospel.

The year 1913 saw another significant appointment in the nomination of the Reverend F. N. Taylor to the parish of St. Luke's, Christchurch. Like St. Michael's, St. Luke's was an inner city church which attracted well to do parishioners from the suburbs. Its former vicar, the Reverend W. W. Sedgewick, was also a popular middle of the road clergyman, who left to become Bishop of Waiapu when Averill was translated to Auckland. The church had been rebuilt in 1909 by Benjamin Mountfort's son, C. J. Mountfort. Although less architecturally pleasing than most of B. W. Mountfort's churches, it fulfilled all the liturgical requirements of an anglo catholic church. Of the high altar of St. Luke's, the Rev. J. Dickson wrote:

The Ritualistic custom of putting a shelf as rere table, and of placing crosses, candles, crucifixes, etc, on it, to evade the Law is only a bit of contemptible juggling unworthy of

a true Christian.²⁴

Taylor was to be vicar of St. Luke's until 1936. He did not wear eucharistic vestments, but he was catholic in his teaching and liturgical practices. By 1916 the main Sunday service was a simple choral eucharist at 9 a.m. He introduced the Merbeck setting of the communion service, one of the more popular settings common to many anglo catholic parishes.

College House was also to experience a change of leadership in 1913. The new principal of the diocesan theological training college was Canon J. R. Wilford, a moderate anglo catholic. He was quite a contrast to his predecessor, Canon C. W. Carrington, who had specialized in biblical studies, and who was very much a low churchman. One of Wilford's students said of him:

He was an Oxford man - the Church was all important - he wasn't "spiky" exactly but he stressed the worship of the Church all the way. He kept a strong Anglican position ...²⁵

It is said that Wilford wore white linen eucharistic vestments. Wilford was firm both in his theological principles and in the way he ran College House, and this sometimes led to clashes with his theological students, many of whom were low churchmen. These conflicts were exacerbated by a personality clash between the principal and the student head of house, W. A. Orange, who was eventually to become the leading evangelical clergyman of New Zealand. A former student recalls one such conflict:

... there was considerable dissatisfaction among some theological students concerning the introduction

24 J. Dickson, note to photographic illustration.^A

25 Interview with Purchas to Rathgen, 14 Apr. 1969, quoted in Rathgen, p. 143.

of the practice of confession for students at the College. My recollections are that Orange was successful in persuading the authorities not to insist upon this.²⁶

Thus by 1914 there was plenty for the opponents of anglo catholicism to be concerned about. Opposition to the growth of anglo catholicism in Christchurch was not confined to the anglican church. The non-conformist churches had felt threatened by this new development in their major protestant partner for quite some time. In 1893 the Reverend W. Gillies published a pamphlet entitled High Churchianity, A Superstition Not New Testament Christianity, which was a reply to a pamphlet by the Rev. R. Coffey, an Anglican clergyman of the Wellington diocese. Gillies was no minor controversialist for he was both the presbyterian minister of Timaru, and also moderator in that year, of the presbyterian church. His summary at the end of the pamphlet is a concise and straightforward list of non-conformist objections to anglo catholicism:

1. High Churchianity is not New Testament Christianity, because it does not, and cannot, find its warrant in the scriptures.
2. High Churchianity is a superstition, because it ties the transmission and communication of a spiritual grace to a manual operation.
3. High Churchianity is a schism, because without warrant of the scriptures, it separates from, and refuses to

26 W. Myhre, 22 Jul 1969, Rathgen, p. 148.

hold communion with, large sections of the Churches of Christ.

4. High Churchianity is virtual Romanism, because it adopts the first principles and the chief tenets of Rome, notably its dictum "no valid ministry, no valid church", its doctrine of apostolic succession, its sacerdotalism, etc.

5. High Churchianity never was adopted by the Church of England, and authoritatively declared to be, and so is not, part of her faith, her doctrine, or her government.

6. High Churchianity is a perverter of history and maligner of its opponents, alike within and without the Church of England.

7. High Churchianity is the great obstacle to the brotherly co-operation of Protestants in the unity of the spirit and the bond of peace, while differing on points of Church government, and to the re-union of the Churches on a scriptural basis.²⁷

Anglican pamphlets of a similar nature argued from a different point of view. Robert Kirk, in his pamphlet of 1899 entitled The Crisis in the Church or the Church of Christ versus Ritualistic Sacerdotalism based his objections to anglo catholicism on appeals to scripture and the 39 articles.

But the most significant publication of this type was the Reverend J. Dickson's Shall Ritualism and Romanism Capture N.Z. published in 1912. Dickson was a

27 W. Gillies, High Churchianity a Superstition Not New Testament Christianity, p. 33.

minister of the Nelson presbytery and his book could boast a preface by the then moderator of the presbyterian church, J. H. Mackenzie. It is a book offering on the front cover "One hundred pounds for anyone who can disprove the statements of this book". His opinions of the 1910 General Mission and the appointment of Father Burton to St. Michael's have already been quoted. The book also contains a denunciation of ritualistic manuals distributed in New Zealand, and singles out for special attention the Mirfield Manuals distributed during the General Mission and the tracts published in the St. Michael's magazine. Summing up his analysis of these publications Dickson declared:

There is scarcely a doctrine of the Church of Rome that is not taught in some manual issued by the ritualists, and sent in thousands everywhere, even to New Zealand, at the ends of the earth.²⁸

He then went on to discuss ritualistic journals and in particular, a Christchurch journal called The Layman. It is a publication which I have been unable to trace, but fortunately Dickson discussed it at some length. It had a monthly circulation of two thousand copies sent to all parts of New Zealand, and was filled with illustrations of vestments and various types of liturgical equipment. Dickson accused it of encouraging clericalism and bigotry towards the protestant denominations. The Layman denied the validity of non conformist orders and discouraged contacts between the anglican clergy and their dissenting brethren. It was also reputed to be inculcating a desire for ritualistic worship in children and breaking down the objections of the laity to private confession to a priest. It con-

28 Dickson, p. 21.

tained a running commentary on the progress of ritualism in other New Zealand dioceses. Dickson concluded his discussion of The Layman by stating:

Let us hope that intelligent people are getting sick of its ritualistic tomfoolery and Romish extravagancies and that it will soon be left high and dry. Its continued prosperity would mean the complete strangulation of all spiritual life in the Church, and completely isolate her from all other branches of the Christian brotherhood.²⁹

This hope was fulfilled, for a note inserted shortly before the publication of his book, announced the demise of The Layman.

Under the subtitle "How Ritualists are Manufactured in New Zealand", Dickson asserted that the greatest threat to evangelical Christianity in the New Zealand anglican church stemmed from the syllabus for 1911-12-13 issued by the board of theological studies for the training of theological students. He complained that in the books set and studies prescribed there was a deliberate attempt to turn anglican theological students into a narrow sacerdotal caste, whose members regarded the Church of England as the only true church. Church history dwarfed every other subject of study:

It is a history that seeks to interpret, to elevate, and sometimes to misrepresent the Prayer Book, to lay great stress on liturgies, and to confine itself, for the most part to a one sided view

29 Dickson, p. 29

of the history of England
and the English church.³⁰

In particular he objected to two books prescribed for advanced students, on the subject of the ministry and the Lord's supper. These were Bishop Gore's The Church and the Ministry and The Body and the Blood of Christ; books which maintained the false doctrines of the apostolic succession and the sacrifice of the eucharist.

Dickson was also concerned at a drifting away from reformation principles on the part of non-episcopal churches. In the presbyterian church he diagnosed the symptoms of such a tendency in the growing centralization of authority in the assembly committees, the shortening of sermons and periods of religious instruction, a decline in the teaching of basic reformation doctrines and of the distinctive principles of presbyterianism, and a lack of interest in anti-roman controversy. He was also concerned at the adoption of hymns written by ritualists and roman catholics, and was extreme enough to object to "Onward Christian Soldiers" as a romish processional hymn and "Abide with me" as inculcating veneration of the material cross.

Dickson advised the opponents of anglo catholicism in the diocese of Christchurch to form themselves into a protestant people's league with the aim of exerting political and religious pressure against ritualistic law breakers. They should also start a journal and circulate literature which would act as an antidote to ritualistic publications. This, he thought, was the logical step for the memorialists who had their case dismissed by Bishop Julius. The rest of the book was taken up with warnings against an expansionist roman catholic church in New Zealand and a defence of basic reformation principles.

30 Dickson, p.33.

It is quite clear that Gillies and Dickson were not isolated extremists. Both were close to the centre of the presbyterian power structure and their writings probably represent a fear of anglo catholicism on the part of influential protestants. Obviously the non-episcopal churches felt threatened by a possible change in the identity of the largest protestant church in New Zealand. The roman catholic evangelical revival had continued steadily from the 1880's on, and some protestants saw anglo catholicism as the fifth column of this advancing "romanism". The denominational divisions between anglicanism and the non-conformist churches had become less pronounced in colonial New Zealand society than in Great Britain. Some protestants feared that the growing influence of anglo catholicism would put a stop to the increasing cordiality of the relationship between the episcopal and non-episcopal protestant churches. There would be no more combined church services and anglicans would go back to their bad habits of the old country of calling their protestant brethren "dissenters" and of asserting that non conformist orders were invalid. If the anglican church were to become completely anglo catholic a large part of the protestant heritage would be lost. Not only would it be a resounding vote of no-confidence in the reformation but it could also lead to a critical reappraisal of basic reformation doctrines. There was also a fear that the contagion of ritualism would spread to the non-episcopal churches. Dickson cited the growing use of the cross in the interior decoration of presbyterian churches, increasingly lavish spending on church building, a growing interest in the aesthetics of ecclesiastical architecture, and in the externals of religion to the detriment of simplicity in worship. A protestant political association existed in Auckland and the "no Popery" cry

could still get a ready response from colonists who had retained the prejudices of the old country. So far as some protestants were concerned, the spread of anglo catholicism meant that the anglican church was marching off the field of battle - into the roman camp.

CHAPTER VII

THE PERRY-GOSSET CASE

Burton's controversial career at St. Michael's lasted a brief five years. He had been a military chaplain attached to the King's Own Scottish Borderers during the Boer war and the outbreak of World War 1 reawakened his interest in this field of service. In late 1915 he left St. Michael's to become chaplain to the hospital ship Marama. Later he was appointed Principal Chaplain to the New Zealand Expeditionary Force, with the rank of lieutenant-colonel. His incumbency had brought a considerable change for St. Michael's, but for Burton himself it had been a fairly unremarkable period in a life filled with remarkable achievements.¹

In May 1916 the Reverend Charles Elliot Perry, an Australian, was instituted as vicar of St. Michael's. Perry was quite a contrast to his predecessor. A cultured, scholarly man he had graduated from St. John's College, Oxford in 1894 with an M.A. in modern history. Far from being a "war horse of the catholic movement" he was a quiet and gentle man who saw his role as being to protect and consolidate Burton's achievement. Perry was accustomed to colonial church life having spent all the preceeding years of his ministry in the diocese of Melbourne. His last parish had been St John's, Camberwell, Victoria.

- 1 Some of the highlights of his career were:
 - 1886 Priest in Charge Royal Small Arms Factory.
 - 1892 Becomes First Diocesan Missioner, Diocese of St Albans.
 - 1924 Leads Mission of Help to Barbados, Diocesan Missioner there for three years.

Before considering the Perry-Gosset case in which he became involved, it is necessary to discuss internal developments at St. Michael's in the period 1916 to 1920. In Burton's time St. Michael's had reached an apogee which it was not to see again for many years. By 1916 the residential areas of the parish were being steadily eroded by the incursion of commercial premises. Perry's preaching was, "quiet, scholarly, cultured, persuasive"² but it did not attract people from near and far as had Burton's more dramatic and spectacular style. Thus church attendances and givings slowly dwindled in this period. Nor was it a unified parish. Some of the congregation did not at heart approve of the ceremonial changes or of Perry. His reserved personality and unemotional preaching were inevitably contrasted with a predecessor who in retrospect could be painted somewhat larger than life. Mrs Perry was not interested in fulfilling the traditional role of a vicar's wife and her disinclination for parish work caused bad feeling on the part of some parishioners. Nor was she at pains to conceal her dislike of her husband's opponents. The most serious opposition to Perry came from the advanced ceremonialists, led by Horace Henderson, the sacristan. Perry was not a ceremonialist. Although he valued ceremonial highly, he had little knowledge of it and thus came to rely on the advice of Henderson. Henderson was passionately interested in the externals of the catholic religion and used his influence to promote a lush and ornate style of ceremonial. At first there were few changes, probably because Henderson was in the army from 1917 to 1919. However from 1920 on, the Henderson party was to have its way. St. Michael's was to see processions the length of the church, with two thuribles on

2 S. R. Cuming, Church of St. Michael And All Angels Christchurch, N.Z. 1872-1972, p.6.

on special feast days. The first Perry knew of the introduction of incense was when one Sunday morning the west doors opened to admit a procession bearing with it a smoking thurible.³ On some days the vicar, choir and people processed from Oxford Terrace over the Bridge of Remembrance down Cambridge Terrace and back to the church. The elaboration of ceremonial was accompanied by a growth in the power and influence of the ceremonialist group. By the early 1920's they were in the majority on the vestry and opposed to a vicar whom they felt was insufficiently interested in ceremonial matters. Although only a small block of parishioners, they were able to exercise a considerable amount of influence on the election of vestrymen. These developments meant that Perry by no means had a united parish behind him even as early as 1918 when Archdeacon C. H. Gosset laid his charges.

The key to understanding the litigation that was to follow is that Archdeacon Gosset was not just trying to curb ritualistic innovations at St. Michael's but was trying to force Bishop Julius to withdraw his protection and endorsement of anglo catholicism. Gosset was an influential clergyman in the diocese. He was vicar of St. Mary's, Merivale from 1902 to 1915 and a member of standing committee from 1910 to 1913. He had been the Archdeacon of Christchurch throughout Burton's incumbency and yet had done nothing about the changes at St. Michael's although the church was within his archdeaconry. Perry was to comment on this puzzling state of affairs in his submissions to the appeal court in 1919:

... I cannot help wondering why
he did not as archdeacon report
the alleged irregularities to the

3 This incident is recounted by S. R. Cuming, an old parishioner.

bishop when they began and not some years later when another vicar had come to the parish and he was no longer archdeacon.⁴

Gosset seems to have been aware of what was going on at St. Michael's but was not spurred into action until he attended the funeral of a Mrs Bishop there on 5 January 1918. A requiem mass accompanied the burial service and Gosset was shocked when he saw that the epistle and gospel were taken from the roman rite instead of the book of common prayer, that the prayer of thanksgiving was read in addition to the prayer of consecration, and that Perry as celebrant was the only person who received the holy communion. To make matters worse, Bishop Julius was present and had taken part in the first part of the burial service and had given the solemn blessing at the end of the requiem mass. An exchange of letters then took place between Archdeacon Gosset and Bishop Julius. Gosset tried to get the Bishop to publicly condemn these irregularities. Here is Gosset's explanation of this correspondence:

... My first letter to the Bishop on the subject in question was dated February 1, 1918, nearly a month after the service at which the irregularities to which I was drawing his attention had taken place, I having waited till then in hopes that he would take action himself. In that letter I also expressed the opinion that the condemnation of such action should be as public as the action itself.

4 Plea on behalf of the judgement of the Bishop of Christchurch before the Bishops of the Province of New Zealand, Feb 1919, SMPO

The Bishop wrote on February 4 that he was in communication with Mr Perry, that his action would depend largely on Mr Perry's attitude in the matter, and as soon as he had anything to communicate he would write again.

On February 25 the Bishop wrote that he had called Mr Perry's attention to certain irregularities, and that Mr Perry had undertaken that they should not occur again, but that he could not agree that the rebuke of such action should be as public as the action itself.

I wrote again pointing out that he- the Bishop - having been present at, and having taken part in, and given the blessing at the conclusion of the service at which the irregularities for which he was admonishing Mr Perry had taken place, churchpeople were necessarily under the impression that he altogether approved of the service in question, and were entitled to be put right on that point.

I suggested that the Bishop should put a statement in the "Church News," in the gazette of the diocese, that his Lordship had been present at St. Michael's on a certain date at which grave irregularities had taken place; that, as otherwise it might be thought that the Bishop approved, he wished churchpeople to know that he had drawn

the vicar's attention to them, and that the vicar had loyally undertaken that they should not recur.

I pointed out that this course could do no harm, but rather good to the vicar and put the Bishop right with his people.

Churchpeople will see that, had the Bishop fallen in with my suggestion, my interference in the matter would have been unknown, the Bishop would have been put right with his people, and I could thereafter have gone to the Bishop, privately, in a friendly manner, as to other matters which might require attention on his part.

The Bishop's refusal to put himself right with his people, and his refusal, later, to deal with other matters, afterwards included in my charges, that were causing trouble and scandal at St. Michael's, in answer to a further letter of mine, left me no other course but to seek justice in the ecclesiastical courts.⁵

And seek justice he did, for on 8 May the diocesan registrar received from Gosset a declaration of eight charges against Perry. The charges were as follows:

1. That Perry did not consume all the consecrated elements after the communion, but instead reserved them in the church.
2. That Perry kept the consecrated elements in a tabernacle in the Pilgrims' chapel at St. Michael's.

3. That he renamed this chapel "the chapel of the Blessed Sacrament" and that he kept a light continually burning before the tabernacle.
 4. That the celebrant at St. Michael's church did, on more than one occasion, after the prayer of consecration, turn to the people, and held towards them the consecrated Bread, with the words "Behold the Lamb of God."
 5. That Perry encouraged and permitted the major part of his congregation "to habitually kneel or prostrate themselves" at the Incarnatus during the recitation of the Nicene creed.
 6. That Perry had taught that confession and absolution were necessary "even for those who are walking earnestly with God" in an article in the Parish Magazine of April 1917 entitled THE EASTER COMMUNION.
 7. That Perry did, in his Parish Magazine, publish certain doctrine on the subject of fasting communion contrary to the doctrine of the church.
 8. That on several occasions Perry had given "the consecrated bread and wine grudgingly, and without the words of administration" to persons whom he believed had not fasted before coming to receive communion.
- The last statement of charge eight revealed the real objective of Gosset's legal action.

And I the said Charles Hillgrove
Gosset charge that if the said Charles
Elliot Perry alleges that such acts
or any such actions were done with
the consent of authority, or permission of the Lord Bishop of
Christchurch either expressed or
implied, then such consent or
authority, or permission, was, and
is unlawful, irregular, void, and

of no lawful effect.⁶

The charges were reported on 22 May in both The Sun and The Press. As well as giving a full background to the story the newspapers announced that Gosset was resigning his archdeaconry in order to make the accusations. The Press called on Perry to make a statement on the charges. Perry wrote to the editor:

I hope, sir, that The Press will observe what I believe to be a noble purpose, and continue to keep religious controversy out of its columns, as long as the war lasts.⁷

Since the legal chaos that had ensued in the prosecution of Carlyon, the disciplinary statutes had been revised. The revised procedure required Perry to file an answer in writing within fourteen days of being served with the charges. The bishop was then to refer the charges and their answers to a court of enquiry which was to ascertain whether they constituted facts or not. The bishop was then to decide whether the matter should be brought to trial. If the bishop authorised a trial, a bishop's court would be constituted. This would be presided over by the Chancellor of the diocese. Of the six clergymen and six laymen who were the assessors of the Bishop's Court, the registrar would draw the names of two clergymen who would sit as jurors at the trial. A public trial would then be held and the jurors would pass their finding to the bishop who would subsequently pass sentence.

There is some doubt as to what steps the bishop did take in May. He told a reporter of The Sun on 23 May that

6 Copy of a Declaration by C. H. Gosset in the matter of a charge preferred against C. E. Perry, 3 May 1918. P5.

7 The Press, 23 May 1918.

the charges against Perry were under investigation by a commission of enquiry. There is no further record of this commission and it is uncertain whether the commission met or came to any conclusion. Perry later alleged that Bishop Julius had asked him to admit the facts of the charges by silence. The new disciplinary statutes had closed Carlyon's old loopholes by declaring that if the accused did not make a formal written answer to the charges within fourteen days of receiving them his silence would be taken as an admission of the facts of the charges. The bishop later denied making this request and the dispute was to cause some tension between Perry and Julius. Whatever really happened, Bishop Julius seems to have been determined to prevent the case coming before the bishop's court over which he would have no control. The canon on discipline provided for a more discreet method of procedure for which Bishop Julius seems to have opted. He must have obtained the consent of Gosset and Perry to pronounce, without further proceedings, such sentence as he should think fit, so long as that sentence was not more severe than might be pronounced in due course of law. But before this more informal method of proceeding could take place further complications arose over the charges.

On 5 June Gosset substituted a new and more extensive declaration of charges for his earlier declaration of May. All eight of the original charges were included. The six additional charges listed as they appeared, were as follows:

3. That Perry sponsored illegal devotions before the reserved sacrament.
 - (a) That he habitually genuflected before the reserved sacrament and encouraged others to do so.
 - (b) That in a booklet published entitled "The Christian's Native Air" Perry authorised the saying of prayers

entitled "A Colloquy" which were illegal prayers, to be said before the illegally reserved sacrament.

(c) That Perry instructed his people to say the "Hail Mary" at the hours of noon and six o'clock.

(d) In "The Chaplet" prayers, Perry had prescribed vain repetitions contrary to the command of Our Lord.

5. That Perry caused a bell to be rung at the words of institution during the prayer of consecration.

6. That at a funeral on 5 January 1918, consisting of the first part of the burial service and the holy communion, Perry had taken the epistle and gospel from the roman rite instead of the book of common prayer and had added the prayer of oblation after that of the consecration. Moreover, Perry, as celebrant, had been the only person to receive the communion.

⌈ This charge had a sting in it directed against Bishop Julius:]

AND that all such acts, or rites, or ceremonies, were committed or done, or performed in the presence of the Lord Bishop of Christchurch who took part in the first part of the Burial Service and gave or pronounced the Blessing at the end of the said Celebration of the Holy Communion.⁸

8. That Perry kept a tabernacle which was not a lawful church ornament, for the reception of the reserved sacrament.

10 That a crucifix was placed on the wall above the pulpit in the Church of St. Michael and that the people were encouraged to bow before the crucifix, such amounting to a worshipping and adoration of an image.

8 Declaration by C. H. Gosset in the matter of a charge referred against C. E. Perry, 5 June 1918, pp. 4-5, NAW

11 That instead of a processional cross, Perry used a staff with an image of Our Lord on the cross, this being an illegal ornament. As with the earlier set of charges there followed a declaration that the consent of the bishop to any of these acts was null and void.

Later in June yet another declaration of charges was substituted by Gosset. The only change was the deletion of the reference to Bishop Julius being present at the funeral of Mrs Bishop. Probably Gosset's lawyer advised him to drop the passage when it became clear that Bishop Julius would be giving judgement without further legal proceedings.

On 8 August Bishop Julius convened a public meeting in the Board Room at Christ's College to hear the legal arguments of both parties. The diocesan chancellor, H. T. Andrews, acted as technical advisor to the bishop. H. D. Acland appeared for Gosset and J. H. Upham, a St. Michael's vestryman, represented Perry. The chancellor emphasized the point that it was not a meeting of the bishop's court. Perry had admitted the facts of the charges by his silence and this circumvented the need for a trial before the bishop's court. Gosset's lawyer had asked the bishop to hear him on the law of the matter and the bishop had decided to give both parties an opportunity to appear before him and state their arguments.

Acland based his case on the claim that the defendant had assented to the constitution of the New Zealand Church and was thus bound to obey the thirty-nine articles and the rules of the prayer book. He then proceeded to recite the charges and to show where he thought each one violated either the constitution, the thirty-nine articles, or the rules of the prayer book. Acland asked the bishop to admonish Perry for his illegal practices and to suspend him until such time as he gave an undertaking

to discontinue them. He asked for an order for the removal of the offending articles and stated that the prosecution was anxious to obtain from the bishop a definite ruling on the questions which had been raised so that these matters would be settled once and for all.

' In reply Upham removed from the arena of debate charges four, six and nine⁹ by stating that they referred to practices which had been discontinued at the bishop's insistence.' Speaking to the charges referring to reservation, Upham stated that Bishop Julius had allowed Burton to reserve the sacrament for the benefit of the sick and dying within the limits of certain uses and restrictions. Burton had not kept within these limits and had not informed Perry of the bishop's restrictions. Thus there had only been an error of inadvertence. Upham went on to defend reservation for the sick by pointing out that the practice had never died out in the Scottish Episcopal Church and by referring to the report of the 1906 Royal Commission of Ecclesiastical Observances which had stated that the law of public worship in the Church of England was too narrow for the religious life of the present generation. The New Zealand constitution did not refer to it at all and could only be taken to reject the practice if it was decided that omission amounted to prohibition. He said that genuflection before the reserved sacrament was a matter of reverence only and that there was no question of adoration or devotion. Similarly, the alleged invocation of the Blessed Virgin in the third charge was merely a quotation from the scriptures to remind people of the incarnation. The ringing of the

9 These charges referred to using the words "Behold the Lamb of God" at the invitation, the offences which occurred at the funeral of Mrs Bishop, the renaming of the Pilgrims chapel and the tabernacle light.

church bell was to give sick people who could not attend an opportunity to be present in spirit at communion. In reference to the eighth charge Upham stated that the tabernacle was merely a decent receptacle for the episcopally approved reserved sacrament:

A crucifix, unless it was likely to cause superstitious adoration, was not unlawful. The eastern window of St. Michael's had never been questioned. It had been put there in the time when Bishop Averill was vicar. If a crucifix was unlawful that window was also. It all depended upon the question whether the people of St. Michael's were likely to adore the cut glass or wood or substance of the window or crucifix. There was no service in the prayer book which provided for processions. What they did outside the services he did not think were relative to the present charges. If they did not use a crucifix in the church he did not see how they could be charged at all. Regarding the public article they said expressly that without confession the sinner could not receive the words: "I absolve thee." That was literally true. It was only necessary to refer to one of the provisions of the Communion service, one more honoured in the breach than the observance - what was called the exhortation. They had never

refused communion to anyone without confession. He had been a consistent communicant at St. Michael's, and had never made a confession. He had never heard it referred to in the pulpit and no pressure, so far as he knew, had been brought to bear on people. This, his friend said was only addressed to sick souls, and he took it that all souls were more or less sick.¹⁰

Upham said that Perry had decided not to contest the charge by giving communion grudgingly since it would cause bad feeling. He assured the bishop that it had been quite inadvertant and unintentional, and would not happen again. Upham finished his submissions by stating that Perry would abide by the bishop's decision, no matter whom it favoured.

Acland summed up with a veiled threat. Since all church property in Canterbury was vested in the Church Property Trustees it might be possible for a person to go to the Christchurch Supreme Court for an injunction to restrain any persons from carrying out services which were beyond the constitution. It might be possible for the Church Property Trustees also to move for such an injunction. Bishop Julius then closed the proceedings and told The Press that it would be at least three weeks before he could give his decision.

In fact two months were to pass before Bishop Julius released his judgement on 3 October. Like his earlier statements on the problems of worship it was lucid, scholarly and well argued. Nor did he confine

10 Press, 9 Aug 1918.

his remarks solely to the doctrinal content of the charges:

Before I go further, however, I feel bound to express my conviction that these proceedings under the Canon are wholly without excuse. If Mr Perry had refused to render due and canonical obedience to his Bishop, something might be said for them; but it was well known to the Archdeacon, before these proceedings were instituted, that I had already admonished the Rev. C. E. Perry in respect of three of the charges which he has brought against him, and that Mr Perry had readily agreed to accept my ruling. In this sad time of war, we are sworn to peace among ourselves and the Church should have been the last to break it.

Another consideration leads me to regard these proceedings as singularly untimely. There has been no revision of the Book of Common Prayer for more than two hundred and fifty years. In that time some of the Rubrics and directions contained in it, originally and perhaps intentionally ambiguous, have become hopelessly obscure, others are obsolete, and in some cases neglect or transgression has attained the force of custom. Prosecutions, Privy Council Judgements, even the Spiritual Courts, have failed to

determine and enforce the law.
 The Crown has, therefore, requested
 the Convocations to take into
 consideration "the law relating to
 the conduct of Divine Service", and
 the revision of the Book of Common
 Prayer is now in progress.¹¹

Bishop Julius went on to state that until such time as
 the church had sufficiently declared her mind in the
 regulation of worship it was up to the bishop to resolve
 all such conflicts. This appeal to the bishop was in
 full agreement with the ancient rule of the church, with
 that of the book of common prayer, and with the canons
 of the Church of New Zealand, and offered the best
 security available against lawlessness on the one hand
 and legal bondage on the other.

Bishop Julius then stated the general principles
 on which his judgement was based:

The Rubrics and directions of
 the Book of Common Prayer may be
 roughly divided into three classes.
 There are first the Rubrics which govern
 the worship of the Church in things
 essential. These are clear and
 unmistakable, and must be literally
 obeyed. Again there are the Rubrics,
 many in number, which concern the
 lesser details of public worship,
 of which some are plain enough, and
 others more or less obscure. These
 are not intended to be rigidly enforced,
 in every case, and under all conditions.

11 Judgement delivered by the Bishop of Christchurch
 in the case of Archdeacon Gosset v. Rev. C.E.
 Perry, CN supplement, 3 Oct. 1918, p.1.

Again there are a few of very small importance, which must be regarded rather as suggestions that directions ... Most of the charges with which I have to do come under the second class.¹²

He referred also to other sources of guidance which could be used where the rubric was obscure or direction was altogether wanting:

1. The teaching of Holy Scripture.
2. The doctrine and practice of "the whole Catholic Church of Christ", to which our Church makes frequent appeal.
3. The present distress. For, in the face of needs which have arisen in our time, even Rubrics must give way.
4. The Living Voice of the Mother Church.¹³

Bishop Julius chose to consider charges one, two, three (a) and (b), and eight, together as all referred to the reservation of the sacrament. His remarks show that he was aware who was the real target of Gosset's charges:

They challenge not only the action of Mr Perry, but also by implication that of the Bishop in allowing Reservation for the sick. It will be necessary for me to show to what extent Mr Perry acted in conformity with the directions of the Bishop and

12 Bishop's judgement, p. 1.

13 Bishop's judgement, pp. 1-2.

whether the Bishop has power to allow of Reservation for any purpose whatsoever. It must be clearly understood in reference to these and other charges that the congregation attending the Church of St. Michael having settled down, and being generally unwilling to change the ritual and form of worship introduced by the later Vicar, I invited Mr Perry to maintain the Services on similar lines, and to avoid further disruption. At the request of the late Vicar, and considering the spiritual needs of the sick and dying in the great Hospital with which he was connected, I allowed Reservation for the Communion of the sick, and ordered the Reserved Sacrament to be reverently kept in the Sacristy or Vestry of the Church. After further conference with the Vicar, towards the unexpected close of his ministry in the parish, I advised that, for the sake of greater seemliness, an Aumbrey or cupboard with doors should be provided, and, after the ancient custom of the English Church, built into the side wall of the Chapel known as the Pilgrim's Chapel, and the Reserved Sacrament kept therein. For this I offered a Faculty, if applied for in the usual way. No such Faculty was

applied for or granted, but, without my knowledge and consent, the Reserved Sacrament was placed in a tabernacle above the altar in the said Chapel, with a light burning before it. Mr Perry, knowing nothing of the conditions under which Reservation had been allowed, maintained the use as he found it.¹⁴

Bishop Julius then embarked on a long and closely argued discussion on the practice of reservation in the early church and the elizabethan church. His discussion also centered around the relationship between reservation and modern pastoral problems and the attitudes of contemporary English authorities towards the practice:

To sum up, I have said enough on this difficult subject to show that Reservation for the Sick is not contrary to the doctrine of the Anglican Church that the custom existed in primitive times, that the necessities of our times require it, that the Archbishops and Bishops of the Mother Church have agreed to sanction it, and that, in the absence of regulation, it may not be introduced in any Parish or Church without consent of the Ordinary.

I, therefore, decide as follows:-
That the first charge against the Rev. C. E. Perry of having acted illegally and contrary to the 28th Article of Religion, and the directions contained

14 Bishop's judgement, p. 2.

in the Book of Common Prayer, under the direction of the Bishop, cannot be sustained. I find that the conditions under which permission was given for the Reservation of the Sacrament have not been fulfilled. If Mr Perry had been responsible for this, I should withdraw the permission. But seeing that he only maintained the position as he found it, and that the spiritual needs of the sick and dying at the General Hospital and other Institutions demand such provision, I shall allow the Reservation of the Blessed Sacrament for the sick in the Church of St. Michael and All Angels, under the following conditions:-

1. That the tabernacle and lamp in the Chapel known as the Pilgrims' Chapel be removed.
2. That an Ambrey or cupboard with doors be built into the side wall of the Chapel, and that the Reserved Sacrament, in both kinds, be reverently placed therein for the Communion of the sick.
3. That all details connected with the Communion of the sick with the Reserved Sacrament be submitted for the approval of the Bishop.
4. That the Vicar and Clergy of the Parish will loyally obey these injunctions, in the spirit as well as in the letter; and see to it that the Reserved Sacrament be used for no other purpose than

the Communion of the sick.¹⁵

Charges three (c) and (d) relating to the prayers of the "Hail Mary" and the "Chaplet" were dismissed for the reasons advanced by Upham. In charge four the bishop held that the words "Behold the Lamb of God" did not teach "idolatrous adoration or worship of the consecrated Bread and Wine", though he did maintain that it was a practice which obscured the true meaning and purpose of the holy communion and must, therefore, be discontinued. In charge five the bishop was prepared to sanction the ringing of the church bell during the Prayer of Consecration as being an ancient and innocent custom but refused to sanction the ringing of the sacring bell since the vernacular liturgy removed any need for it. Charge number six, referring to the irregularities which occurred at Mrs Bishop's funeral, was considered irrelevant since the bishop had already admonished Perry on this count before proceedings were instituted, and he had agreed to accept the episcopal ruling.¹⁶ Of charge number seven relating to the kneeling of the people at the incarnatus during the Nicene Creed, Bishop Julius said that he was not prepared to demand a rigid uniformity which limited the freedom of worshippers. Of charges ten and eleven, referring to the crucifix and its alleged adoration as an image, Bishop Julius ruled that the crucifix was a lawful ornament and that a reverencing of it could not be confused with the worshipping and adoration of images condemned in article twenty-two.

Of charge number twelve relating to Perry's article which stressed the importance of private confession to a priest, Bishop Julius declared that even at the height

15 Bishop's judgement, p.3.

16 See p. 192.

of the puritan reaction from the extravagancies of the past, the Anglican church had never lost her confidence in the priestly power of absolution. Nor had she failed to give the most explicit guidance for the exercise of this power. Not only did a general confession exist in the liturgy of the church, but there was also a direct and personal absolution after private confession, to be found in the service for the visitation of the sick. According to the prayer book all were to be invited to come to the priest for counsel and absolution:

It must be allowed that we have grievously neglected these instructions. There are many Churches in which this invitation has never been heard, many Priests who have never given it, and thousands upon thousands of men and women, weary and heavy-laden,[?] who want something more than advice - and never get it. Neglect on the one side means over-statement on the other. I think that Mr Perry has been guilty of serious over-statement in the Article headed "The Easter Communion". His heading in that Article ----

1. Conveys the impression that it is the duty of every Christian to go to confession.
2. Suggests a somewhat mechanical process for the cleansing of the soul, as though private Confession and Absolution were a kind of cleaning up for a special occasion, without particular reference to repentance and faith, even for those

who are living in mortal sin.¹⁷

With regard to charge thirteen, in which Perry was alleged to have insisted on fasting communion, the bishop said that this practice had continued in the church since the earliest times although there was no reference to it in the book of common prayer:

Mr Perry is fully justified in teaching and maintaining the practice of Fasting Communion; and, although I do not like the tone of his Article, I can find nothing worthy of censure, except in one particular. In this, as in the last case, Mr Perry over-states his case. He seems to ignore the fact that for two centuries the custom has generally fallen into obedience, that no attempt was made to maintain it, that the hours of Public Worship were so changed that obedience to the Custom of the Church became almost impossible. What has for so long been neglected by Clergy and Laity alike cannot be suddenly restored and insisted upon. Mr Perry does insist, and that in the strongest terms, by putting his people on their honour not to communicate except fasting. Further, he ignores the fact that in many country places it is impossible to secure rigid obedience to the rule and at the same time encourage frequent Communion. I dismiss the charge that Mr Perry has in his Article written anything contrary to

17 Bishop's judgement, p.4.

the doctrine contained in the Book of Common Prayer, or in Article xxviii, and I counsel him to encourage his people to observe the rule of the Church without bringing them into bondage.

Such is my judgement. I have not sought to please either party, nor to effect a compromise. I have endeavoured to be faithful in my interpretation of the law, and the exercise of my authority. I hope that both parties to the suit will accept my judgement as final, at least for the time being, and that neither of them will further disturb the peace of the Church.¹⁸

The judgement was received with jubilation at St. Michael's. Perry at once published his submission to the judgement in the Press. Preaching at the patronal festival evensong on 6 October he told his people:

In only two matters am I personally found to have been at fault. I am admonished for over-statement in teaching on two matters of discipline, not for extravagance in ritual ... I accept this admonition ... with due submission ... The Bishop is a true Father-in-God, I desire to be a true son in the Faith.¹⁹

Archdeacon Gosset promptly appealed against the judgement to the appeal court of the Bench of Bishops.

A long pause followed before the court of appeal

18 Bishop's judgement, p. 5.

19 Press, 7 Oct. 1918.

began to move into action. The court consisted of Bishop W. W. Sedgewick of Waiapu, Bishop T. H. Sprott of Wellington, Bishop A. W. Averill of Auckland, with the Primate, Bishop S. T. Nevill of Dunedin presiding. Bishop Julius advised Perry to attend the court hearing without counsel since he (Julius) would not be present. Accordingly Perry was summoned to appear before the Bench of Bishops on 19 February 1919. Gosset's case was presented by a Mr Sinclair, a Dunedin lawyer. In his notes on the case, Perry stated that he had attended the court of appeal expecting the subject to be the bishop's judgement and not his conduct. He had prepared no explanation in defence of those points which especially concerned himself, supposing that Bishop Julius had dealt finally with them. In his introductory remarks Perry expressed surprise that he had been chosen to defend the Julius judgement. He pointed out that he had been hardly three years in the diocese, and that he was not a properly trained theologian. He also pointed out that he had not established the existing regime of worship at St. Michael's. Not one ceremony or doctrine objected to had originated from him, with the exception of the placing of the prayer of oblation immediately after the consecration in the communion service. This practice had been discontinued at the bishop's instruction before the legal proceedings began. However he admitted that he had known what kind of church St. Michael's was before he accepted the living and that he acknowledged his responsibility for maintaining what he found but not for inaugurating it. The greater part of his arguments was taken up with two objects. They were:

To show that Reservation for the Sick has been the normal practice of the Catholic Church from the earliest times and that according

to the law of the Church. That it is the law of the Church of England never repealed by the authority that made it.

That although it fell into obedience for a time, it was never forbidden and that it can be revived if according to the principles of Canon Law it is for the good of souls and the Glory of God. That it is being revived and that rapidly all over the Anglican Communion except in the Episcopal Church of Scotland where it has never ceased to be practiced.

To show that the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council is unworthy of credit because of its origin and its composition and that none of its decisions either before or after the Constitution of the Province of New Zealand have any weight in ecclesiastical matters.²⁰

The arguments advanced on these two subjects were voluminous and may well have taken the greater part of the day to plead. Presumably the validity of the Privy Council's decisions were discussed at such great length because it was anticipated that Gosset's counsel would use them as the basis of his case. The other charges referred to in the bishop's judgement received only minor attention.

Perry was rather distressed at the way he was treated by one of the bishops:

20 Appeal court plea, February 1919, SMPO.

The Bishops of the Court prevented one of their number from cross questioning me on these three points (on which Julius had admonished Perry for being over zealous) as though they thought with me that it was the Bishop's judgement that was the matter of enquiry and that I was not on my trial.²¹

Perry also told the court that Bishop Julius had asked him to admit all the charges at the beginning. As we shall see later this must have caused Julius some chagrin.

When the submissions were ended the bishops told Perry that they would make no announcement until after another meeting which they would have in May at the time of the general synod. Although this further meeting is not recorded, it is almost certain that it did take place in May and that three of the bishops reached their final decision (a majority of three was required). Sister Edith and her deaconesses held a day long vigil of prayer when the court of appeal was sitting in Dunedin.

Although the bishops had probably reached their verdict in May, the final judgement was not released until July. There are two probable reasons for this. The Bishop of Auckland had dissented from his colleagues in two important matters in an official document privately released to his colleagues in May. Meanwhile the Primate and the two other bishops were looking for a recent statement by a widely acknowledged overseas authority to back up their stand on these two matters.

The court of appeal met in Dunedin on 17 June to deliver its judgement. The bishops' conclusions can be grouped under eleven headings.

21 Notes on the procedure in Gosset v Perry, SMPO.

(1) RESERVATION - The Court held that reservation, especially for the sick, was not condemned by the twenty-eighth article of religion:

In answer to the allegation that in reserving the sacrament Mr Perry used an unauthorised form of service, it was contended for the defence that reservation was authorised by lawful authority - the authority of the Bishop of Christchurch. This contention was upheld in the Bishop of Christchurch's decision, and the Court of Appeal, (the Bishop of Auckland dissenting) held that the Bishop of Christchurch was right. The Court affirmed that the reservation of the sacrament is not contrary to any doctrine of the Church. It is simply a question of order or form, and may be permitted if sanctioned by "lawful authority" - and the authority of the bishop of the diocese is the "lawful authority" contemplated by the law of the church.²²

(2) DOCTRINE OF THE CORPORATE PRESENCE CORPORAL - The Court held that this decision did not involve approval of the doctrine of the corporal presence of Christ in the consecrated elements. Such teaching would be contrary to article twenty-eight and the law of the New Zealand Church.

With regard to the use of a prayer entitled "A Colloquy" before the reserved sacrament:

The Court does not consider that there is any false teaching in the Colloquy, nor that its use in the

22 C.G., 1 Aug. 1919, p. 119.

manner alleged indicated a belief that the Sacrament would have a wholesome effect or effect apart from it being unworthily received but we regard the practice as foreign to the mind and teaching of our Church. It is to be noted that the conditions laid down by the Bishop of Christchurch for the Reservation in the future take away any opportunity for such practice.²³

(3) INVOCATION OF THE VIRGIN MARY - If Perry had taught the invocation of the Blessed Virgin Mary then such teaching was obviously illegal. However it was by no means clear that this had been Perry's intention and the words of the "Hail Mary" did not necessarily involve the invocation of the Blessed Virgin Mary. With regard to the "vain repetitions" alleged in the Chaplet the Court agreed with Bishop Julius that the repetitions could scarcely be counted vain. The Court also agreed with the decision of Bishop Julius that there was no authority of any kind for the officiating priest at the communion service holding before the people the consecrated bread and saying, "Behold the Lamb of God".

(4) SACRING BELL - The Court agreed with the Bishop of Christchurch's decision that the church bell could be rung at the consecration but not the sacring bell within the sanctuary.

(5) THE REQUIEM MASS - The Court agreed with Bishop Julius that the practices stated in the charges were illegal. However, since Perry had been admonished, and had agreed to accept the Court's ruling, the Court did not think it necessary to deal further with this matter.

23 Appeal Court Judgement, 17 Jul 1919, p.3. NAW.

(6) KNEELING AT THE INCARNATUS.

There does not appear to the Court to be any question of Doctrine involved and it is obvious that even by Rubrics it is impossible to control the attitude of worshippers but a Priest has no authority to direct his people to assume any attitude contrary to that prescribed in the Rubric.²⁴

(7) THE TABERNACLE - If the tabernacle had been used as a receptacle for the reserved elements it was illegal and should be removed as the Bishop of Christchurch had ordered. If the Pilgrims' Chapel in which reservation occurred had been improperly named then this was a matter for the Christchurch Church Property Trustees. The Court also confirmed the action of the Bishop of Christchurch in ordering the removal of the light continually burning before the tabernacle.

(8) THE CRUCIFIX - The use of a crucifix on the pulpit wall and as a processional cross was not forbidden by the articles of religion or the law of the New Zealand Church. This affirmed the opinion of Bishop Julius.

(9) COMPULSORY CONFESSION - Here the Court disagreed with Bishop Julius' ruling:

It is quite clear that the Church does not hold the Doctrine that Confession and Absolution thereafter are necessary. Such a doctrine appears to this Court to be more than a serious overstatement and it is in our opinion contrary to the authorised teaching or doctrine

24 Appeal Court Judgement, p.4., NAW.

of the Church as set forth in the Book of Common Prayer ... It should be noted that the Court is now dealing with this charge as laid and as the fact is admitted by Mr Perry and not as the Bishop of Christchurch appears to have done after a perusal of the Article in the Magazine in which the teaching is given. The opinion of the Court being as expressed it is for the Bishop of Christchurch to decide what if any penalty should be imposed in respect of the offence.²⁵

(10) FASTING COMMUNION- Again the Court disagreed with Bishop Julius:

While we agree ... that Fasting Communion is a laudable custom in the Church we cannot accept the statement that it is a rule laid down by the Church. Mr Perry's teaching as it appears in the Article quoted from his Parish Magazine appears to the Court to be contrary to the teaching of our Church.²⁶

It remained for the Bishop of Christchurch to say what penalty should be imposed for the omission of the words of administration in giving the sacramental bread and wine to persons whom Mr Perry believed to have presented themselves for communion without fasting.

(11) POWERS OF BISHOPS - The Court agreed with the Bishop of Christchurch that in an era of liturgical chaos in which there were few authoritative guidelines it was necessary that there be some authority to be appealed to in cases of conflict:

25 Appeal Court Judgement, p.5. NAW.

26 Appeal Court Judgement, p.6. NAW.

The Bishop of Christchurch claims that such authority is inherent in the office of a Bishop and it may well be that he is right, though the point has been called in question and much debated in New Zealand on account of The words of the Fundamental Clauses of our Constitution. . . But whether the authority be inherent or not it is at least clear that the Prayer Book itself does confer an authority on the Bishop ... No doubt when the Revised Prayer Book has been sanctioned by Act of Parliament, the Church in New Zealand will have an opportunity through the General Synod of declaring her mind on this and other matters but it does appear to us that in the meantime unless there is to be a complete legal "Bondage" affording no relief from ambiguous obsolete and oppressive rules the Bishops must be allowed to exercise discretion and take order for the quieting and appeasing of doubts and diversities.²⁷

An unlooked-for consequence of the appeal court judgement was a soul-searching debate among the bench of bishops as to the amount of authority allowed them by the Constitution. It will be remembered that in the charges relating to reservation the defence had argued that reservation had been authorised by the lawful authority of the Bishop of Christchurch and the court of appeal had agreed that Bishop Julius possessed

27 Appeal Court Judgement, pp. 8-9., NAW

this lawful authority under the constitution.²⁸ Bishop Averill of Auckland disagreed on these two matters in a separate document appended to the judgement. His contention was that so far as the constitution of the New Zealand Church was concerned, there was no lawful authority which could order reservation of the sacrament for any purpose. He maintained that reservation was forbidden by the sixth rubric at the end of the communion office although he personally approved of reservation for the sick, but only in extreme cases, when specially desired, and so that it would be administered at once. He also believed that his fellow bishop's concept of their lawful authority was reasonable and catholic and would promote order and good government in the church, but he could not believe that the constitution allowed the authority of the bishop to go as far as they indicated.

However the appeal court judgement was legally valid since it had obtained the necessary majority of three bishops. The three bishops were obviously concerned about the dissentient voice of Bishop Averill and quoted in support of their judgement a recent decision of "a very important committee of the Lambeth conference". This committee consisted of twenty-nine bishops from all parts of the world, including the Archbishops of Canterbury, York, Armagh, Dublin, and Sydney, and the Bishops of London, Durham and Salisbury. Their decision was:

That after considering certain difficulties brought before them in regard to the administration of the Holy Communion to the Sick the committee recommend that these difficulties should be left to be dealt with by the Bishop of Each

Diocese.²⁹

In general the appeal court had supported the judgement of Bishop Julius although it had taken a stronger line on the matters of compulsory confession and fasting communion and had used stronger language in condemnation of practices of which it disapproved.

The judgement was published in a Dunedin paper but for some inexplicable reason no more was heard of it for the next two months. Perry was never shown a copy of the final judgement and only discovered its general drift from various secondary sources. Bishop Julius gave no sign that further legal proceedings would be necessary and Perry concluded that this was the end of the matter and that the Julius judgement was final. In fact Julius did not receive an official copy of the judgement until 23 September. Perry claimed that he was instructed on the constitution by the chancellor of the diocese who told him that he must retract his articles on compulsory confession and fasting communion or be suspended.

Another month was to elapse before the bishop's court of the diocese of Christchurch sat to take final action. During this interval an argument broke out between Perry and Julius as to the admission of the facts of Gosset's charges by silence. It should be noted that we have only Perry's side of this argument. On 29 July 1919 Perry's lawyer had inserted a statement in The Press explaining why Perry had decided to admit the truth of the facts charged by making no reply to them. Upham pointed out that some of the facts charged, such as the publication of certain articles in the Parish Magazine, were definite and capable of direct admission or denial. Other charges were very difficult to prove

29 Note appended to the judgement of the Bishops on charge one of the appeal by the president, NAW.

or disprove, such as the allegation that communion was in certain cases given grudgingly. If the question was litigated it might give rise to an unseemly dispute and considerable ill feeling.³⁰ In late September Perry's lawyer sent in a form of retraction in response to the Chancellor's ultimatum. The retraction contained a protest against the way in which the charges had been laid, alleging that fact and inference had been mixed. The bishop rejected the retraction and Perry duly submitted another one. As he was signing this he told the chancellor that the bishop had asked him (Perry) to admit all the charges and that he had considered him (the bishop) responsible for the way the proceedings had gone. The bishop then wrote to Perry denying that he had asked Perry to admit the charges. He also sent back the retraction which he said he could not consider genuine unless Perry returned it with a note to the effect that his bishop had not asked him to admit the charges. Perry then submitted a guarded reply. Although he had always understood that the bishop had asked him to admit the charges, he would not categorically say that Julius had made this request.³¹ Privately he believed that the bishop had forgotten his request. He therefore asked the bishop to accept the retraction and Julius did so.

30 If Perry's notes in the margin of his personal copy of the 3 May charges (property of S. R. Cumíng) can be believed litigation on this point would have been hotly contested. "Have heard of two who gave up attending because of what I had taught on Fasting Communion. Two others I repelled from Communion for a period not demanding any confession from either but advising it from one. Both had been convicted in civil courts. Neither of these concerned about fasting communion however".

31 This is my interpretation of a confused piece of text from Perry's notes on the procedure in the case. The text is as follows: "I wrote to say that I had understood that he had but not saying that he had not." I am assuming that "not" is a later interpolation.

This was a private conflict. Publicly, Perry was full of praise for the bishop. He wrote to his parishioners:

It is most comforting to have the declaration of the Bishops on behalf of so many features of our worship. The red lamp, the tabernacle and the Sanctuary bell which were not under episcopal sanction remained so, but all the other things are now allowable. I think it most likely that the stand which our Bishop took right at the beginning will make his episcopate as famous in the history of this Province as anything else; for say what will, it is questions about the worship of God which really matter now and posterity judge us by our connection with the great movement for its improvement in the English Church.³²

The case came to an end on 8 October when Julius presided over a sitting of the bishops court to take final action on the three charges of which Perry had been found guilty. Since Perry had retracted his error in the matter of compulsory confession, fasting communion, and the giving of the eucharistic elements without the words of administration, the proceedings were a formality. Perry's retraction was publicly read and the bishop then admonished him. He said that since Perry had publicly agreed to conform to the book of common prayer to obey his bishop's direction, there was no need for any further punishment or dealing with the matter in respect to the errors of doctrine. In future Perry must be more careful to restrain his words,

32 . The Parish Herald, Aug. 1919, pp. 2-3.

and to avoid such statements as had been condemned by the court of appeal. Speaking of the matter of practice of which Perry had been found guilty, the bishop said:

I am not sure how far he knowingly committed error. I have admonished him, and with his promise and declaration in the matter I shall be content. I therefore declare the matter at an end, thanking God that a case which has been so painful to all of us has come to a close.³³

On 15 October a letter appeared in The Sun from Archdeacon Gosset in which he spoke his mind on the case:

In the judgement of the Bishop of Christchurch, which you published in your columns last October, the Bishop thought fit to make an attack on me personally, quite apart from his decision on the facts charged by me ...

He explained that while the judgement was before the appeal court he was prevented by well-known principles of English justice from publicly defending himself against Bishop Julius's attack. Now that the bishops had given their judgement he was free to defend himself:

The attack made upon me by the Bishop was to the effect that the proceedings instituted by me under the Canon were wholly without excuse.

(1) Because I well knew, before proceedings were instituted, that he had already admonished Mr Perry as to three of the charges, and that Mr Perry had already agreed to accept

33 The Sun, 8 Oct. 1919.

his ruling.

(2) Because, "in this sad time of war we are sworn to peace among ourselves and the Church should have been the last to break it."

I will deal with the second branch of the attack first. It is easy to shelter behind the war and the necessity for peace among ourselves, but there is also the danger of crying "Peace, peace, when there is no peace."

I knew that the practices which I myself saw at a particular service, and others of which I heard subsequently embodied in my charges ... were causing widespread comment and unrest among earnest churchpeople, and were driving old parishioners of St. Michael's away from the church...

I could not feel that the fact that it was wartime was sufficient, after I myself had observed grave irregularities which I was convinced were doing infinite harm to the church in the diocese, to justify me in sitting still and making no effort to have them stopped, and the fact that they were irregularities made plain to all earnest churchmen.

To go back to the first branch of the bishop's attack upon me, viz., that I knew, before I instituted the proceedings, that his Lordship had admonished Mr Perry as regards three of the irregularities pointed out by

me, and that Mr Perry had accepted his ruling and undertaken in future to abstain from the practices in question.

This statement is half truth, and utterly misleading in that, whilst correct as far as it goes, it does not indicate the point on which the Bishop and I were at variance. It makes no mention of the fact that it was his refusal to make public the fact that these irregularities which he as well as I had seen take place, WERE IRREGULARITIES and disapproved of by him, which obliged me to take action through the ecclesiastical courts. The only means open to me to reassure churchmen and allay the unrest caused by the Bishop's apparent sanction of these objectionable practices.³⁴

The most obvious feature of the Perry-Gosset case is that it represents a moral victory for St. Michael's and anglo catholicism. The appeal court decision stands in complete contrast to the Kaiapoi judgement handed down by the bench of bishops in 1877, when even the mixed chalice had been declared illegal. The Perry-Gosset case established the legality of reservation for the sick, within certain limits, the "Hail Mary" and other catholic devotions, and the use of the crucifix as an ornament and a processional cross. The bulk of St. Michael's ceremonial remained intact and it is interesting to note that Gosset did not challenge the legality of the eastward position, eucharistic vestments or prayers for the

34 Sun, 15 Oct. 1919.

dead. Obviously these points could not be disputed with any reasonable hope of success. The appeal court decision contained two important implications. The New Zealand Church had to allow for variety in church worship to fit the change and variety of conditions while frankly recognising that the old ideal of uniformity was dead. The bishop had the right and the duty to regulate any modifications to the worship of the church. That the bench of bishops was prepared to claim that the constitution designated them the "lawful authority" which could permit reservation, is a sign that they had an increasingly catholic concept of their office. It could be argued that one of the most important consequences of the Perry-Gosset case was that it demonstrated the value of episcopal authority in New Zealand. It certainly increased the power of the episcopacy in doctrinal matters. Ironically it was Burton who was the real culprit in the case. It was he who initiated almost all of the practices complained of in the charges. The dispute over reservation need not have taken place if Burton had fulfilled the legal uses and restrictions required by Bishop Julius and had informed his successor of the restrictions attached to this practice. Perry behaved charitably and honourably throughout, despite his unenviable position as the middleman in a conflict between Gosset and Julius. Gosset's motives for taking action through the ecclesiastical courts seem to have been to force Bishop Julius to publicly concede that there was a uniform order of worship to which all clergymen must conform. If the Bishop of Christchurch acknowledged that this uniform order of worship existed he would be obliged to suppress the ritualistic innovations at St. Michael's. Julius had long made up his mind that a reasonable variety in churchmanship was not incompatible with a formal adherence to the prayer book and the

thirty nine articles, and his actions in the Perry Gosset case merely confirmed his general policy. There does seem to be some grounds for believing that Julius had convenient lapses of memory. But in a diplomat and prelate in a difficult situation they might be regarded as venial rather than mortal sins.

CHAPTER VIII

CONCLUSION

It would be a mistake to think that the Perry-Gosset case removed all prejudices against anglo catholicism at a stroke. The 1925 electoral synod which met to elect the successor of Bishop Julius, revealed the strength of lingering anti anglo catholic feeling. Bishop Talbot of Pretoria was rejected because a synodsmen had seen him officiating in cope and mitre.¹ Instead, the scholarly, middle of the road C. W. West-Watson, was chosen. But the Perry-Gosset case does mark the end of the seminal period of anglo catholicism in the diocese of Christchurch. By 1920 the movement had been accepted into the mainstream of the Canterbury anglican church.

Turning to the beginnings of the Canterbury settlement we can conclude that much of the initiative for its founding came from the tractarian members of the Canterbury Association. There was a close relationship between the Oxford movement and the Canterbury Association. It is evident that there was a substantial injection of tractarian ideology into the Canterbury project through the "political Puseyism" of Godley, and the similar ideals of Lord John Manners's Young England party. The tractarians involved themselves with the Canterbury Association because of the social and political implications of their churchmanship. Their social vision was based on a romantic, conservative protest against democracy and

1 Recounted by S. R. Cuming, a 1925 electoral synodsmen.

industrialism. They wished to alleviate social distress and postpone a social cataclysm in Britain by emigration, and create a pious and just hierarchical society in Canterbury. They also wished to create a powerful and glorious branch of the Church of England at a time when the mother church seemed to be breaking up. It seems probable that this was to be a free episcopal church with many inherited advantages and no erastian shackles. It would be fair to say that Godley and his fellow tractarians became involved in the Canterbury Association primarily because of their tractarian ideology. However, their religious and social vision faded as they faced the practical problems of actually implementing the project. No other party in the Church of England seems to have had the ideals or the energy to sponsor such a thoroughly ecclesiastical venture. Without Godley's "political Puseyism", Wakefield's plan of colonisation would only have been an interesting idea. In this sense tractarianism can be said to have given practical substance to the Canterbury project. The Association's membership contained a relatively small but powerful group of tractarians and their sympathisers, with a small but influential representation on the Management Committee. Most of the members of the Management Committee were moderate or non-party churchmen. The Association seems to have been relatively free from internal party strife and, with one or two exceptions, its members stuck to the practicalities of the business in hand. Members did their feuding outside the Association although these external feuds had quite an impact on the Association's affairs. However, despite all the care of its founders, the Association was unfairly labelled a Puseyite affair by low church detractors from its inception, and the unfortunate label stuck. The Church of England was in a distracted state over the Gorham judgement and

the Papal aggression, and both the British public and the prospective emigrants seem to have been largely unsympathetic to tractarianism (i.e. tractarianism inspired colonisers but not colonists). The Canterbury project began just at the moment when the Church of England was being strained to the limits of its toleration. The "Puseyite label" problem became acute in 1850-1 and revealed itself in three specific crises: the bishopric question, the Papal aggression and John Simeon's defection to Rome. In this atmosphere the Association found it difficult to convince prejudiced public opinion that it was not a "regular Puseyite affair". This public distrust helped produce the Association's difficulties in selling land, enlisting colonists, raising loans and finding a suitable bishop. These problems became particularly acute in 1851. However, the Association gained in partial measure its primary objectives when two main expeditions of colonists departed for Canterbury in 1850 and 1851. The colonists, coming mainly from the middling and lower-middle ranks of English society, were a cross-section of anglican laity. Hence, they included a majority of low church members. It is probable that the tractarian organisers recognised that their colony would necessarily be of this ecclesiastical composition as soon as they came to grips with the actual project of procuring immigrants, whether clerical or lay. Anglo catholics were, by contrast with the original high hopes, in an even small minority than might have been expected. Anglo catholicism was not an emigrant's faith.

Anglicanism had rather an uncertain beginning in Canterbury. The colony's clergy were not always of the highest quality and the lack of a bishop hampered the functioning of a church whose structure was built around a strong central authority. As a result of various economic and social developments within the colony, the

anglican church soon lost some of the privileges bestowed on it. The arrival of Bishop Harper did much to solve the problems of the young colonial church and an examination of his background reveals him as a moderate churchman who had selectively adopted tractarian principles. In this he was like his friend Selwyn, who had appointed him. The Canterbury church was a pre-Oxford movement church with a predominantly low churchmanship. However, there was more diversity than might be expected and a small body of anglo catholic laity existed in the diocese from the beginning of the settlement. Tractarianism's clerical representative was the eccentric mission priest, W. H. Cooper. Some clergy, not bound too closely to low church principles, tried to improve the prayer book as a vehicle of worship and Bishop Harper sanctioned a procedure for modest liturgical change. In a word, tractarianism did not take root in the colony in 1850, nor did the colony become a branch of the continuing tractarian movement. Anglo catholicism in Canterbury turned out to have far weaker roots than might have been expected in 1850. The religious tone of Canterbury was set, not by its founders, but by its actual emigrant clergy and laity. It became in fact a low church community in which the accepted attitudes were actually hostile to anglo catholicism and hence to the ecclesiastical hopes of Canterbury's founders.

It was against this background that the abortive beginnings of ritualism in the Carlyon case at Kaiapoi must be seen. Carlyon lost the argument because a majority of Canterbury anglicans believed that there was a uniform order of worship to which all clergymen must conform and that this uniformity was based on reformation doctrines. He was also defeated by the sheer power of inertia which resisted any attempt to change the status quo. Canterbury was the home of a fragment of the pre-Oxford movement church. This church had been cut off

from the stimulus for change which it would have experienced in England and had lapsed into a kind of immobility. Like most colonial societies, Canterbury was traditionalist, conservative, and resented any attempt by outside influences to shift the frozen status quo. This was to be the undoing of Carlyon. He had too many new ideas for a slow moving colonial society which had very set ideas about what the anglican church ought to be. Bishop Harper tried to protect Carlyon because he was sympathetic to moderate tractarianism and wished to see a broader range of anglican attitudes within the diocese. He feared that an unjust persecution of Carlyon would cut off the supply of English clergy to New Zealand. However, the stubbornness of Carlyon and the militancy of the low church party forced Harper to abandon the way of compromise and allow the prosecution to take place.

A comparative examination of colonial churches in this period suggests another reason for Canterbury's opposition to the Oxford movement. In Australia, the colonial church was dominated by erastianism and lacked a strong basis of support among the upper classes and was even weaker in its support among the middle and lower classes. Bishops were not introduced for quite some time and a strong congregationalism, which was to resist the eventual imposition of episcopal authority, developed. Considerable political pressure from dissenters, particularly over the education question, was another problem. Australian anglicanism was more ready for tractarianism as a means of maintaining its denominational identity. Inevitably the movement was dominated by the clergy because there was little vigorous lay support. The Oxford movement had been introduced into Australia by English bishops and clergy. Tractarianism was gaining strength in Australia throughout the 1840's although it was divided and weak in England. It is

little surprise that this happened, for the Oxford leaders had been prominent in the colonial bishopric fund and in the setting up of the Tasmania diocese:

When the Movement largely failed
in England, they (the Oxford leaders)
looked to the colonial churches to
be the type of the catholic
church they believed the Anglican
Church to be when not limited by
a state nexus or by an Erastian
liberalism.²

Other colonial churches were in a similar situation in the early nineteenth century. The Protestant Episcopal Church of America was threatened by both deism and liberalism. In Canada the church lost vast amounts of land set aside for the maintenance of clergy and had to finance its maintenance and extension work from independent sources. Both these colonial churches were obliged to seek a true religious identity against both liberalism and erastianism. [The church in Canterbury faced none of these problems. It was not subject to state control. It had stronger support from the upper classes and a wider basis of popular support. Bishop Harper arrived before an anti-episcopal congregationalism could develop, though the disastrous episode of Jackson left him some leeway to make up. Dissenters were troublesome over the education issue but they lacked the political influence of their Australian counterparts. The laity of the Christchurch diocese were interested and active in church affairs. Nor was the orthodoxy of the Canterbury church threatened by theological liberalism. The anglican church here already had a strong denominat-

2 Austin P. Cooper, "The Oxford Movement and Australia", (unpublished thesis) p. 402. Many of the ideas for this comparative examination of colonial churches are drawn from this Ph. D. thesis.

ional identity and did not feel the need for a strong church movement to achieve one in the Australian, Canadian manner. This is, perhaps, one of the reasons why anglo catholicism made little progress in the first 30 years of the Canterbury settlement.

Anglo catholicism was unobstrusively introduced into Phillipstown in the 1880's because of a fortuitous and favourable combination of factors. At Phillipstown a strongly anglo catholic lay element developed over the years. Under the leadership of Benjamin Mountfort it welcomed and indeed came to demand the changes. This remarkable man was largely responsible for the adoption of catholic ceremonial in Phillipstown. His churchmanship had a considerable impact on the designing of many churches in the diocese. Phillipstown was a small mainly working class parochial district of fairly recent origins, which did not have the prominence or prestige to attract the attention of the militant low church party. Its moderate anglo catholicism was a reflection of the personality of its vicar, the Reverend H. J. C. Gilbert. The work of C. A. Fraer at Tuahiwī was to pass similarly unnoticed.

A review of the period 1900-14 shows that in these years the diocese of Christchurch moved towards a more tolerant view of anglo catholicism. Some of the necessary prerequisites for the emergence of anglo catholicism had been established by the formation of the Community of the Sacred Name, the 1910 General Mission of Help and the tolerant attitudes of Bishop Julius. The central achievement of the movement was its capture of St. Michael's in 1910. This achievement was probably made possible by the anxiety of the St. Michael's vestrymen who thought that missionary anglo catholicism might be the answer to falling church attendances. The success of anglo catholicism there must be attributed to the

remarkable personality of the Reverend H. D. Burton. Opposition to the changes at St. Michael's came from two groups. Low church anglicans opposed ritualistic innovations for much the same reasons as Carlyon's opponents. Their memorial of protest failed to persuade Bishop Julius to suppress the innovations at St. Michael's and elicited from him a cautious tolerance of the anglo catholic position.

Some non conformist christians were concerned about the growth of anglo catholicism in New Zealand and their fears were expressed in the writings of two prominent presbyterian clergymen. The new movement was opposed because it was felt to threaten the protestant churches. Anglo catholicism was represented as the advance guard of an expansionist roman catholicism. It was seen as a threat to co-operation between protestant christians and a revival of traditional anglican bigotry towards the non-episcopal churches. It was also feared that ritualism would spread like a contagious disease to non-episcopal churches.

The Perry-Gosset case can be seen as a parallel to the 1889 Lincoln case in England. In each instance an attempt to force a bishop to end episcopal protection of ritualists resulted in a moral victory for anglo catholicism. For Christchurch it was a victory that made the movement officially acceptable. The Perry-Gosset decision recognised that the era of uniformity was over, that the New Zealand church had to allow for variety in worship to fit the change and variety of conditions, and that the bishop had the right and the duty to regulate any modifications to the worship of the church. It also declared a large number of ritualistic customs to be legal.

This major change in Christchurch anglican faith and practice can be interpreted against the background

of the New Zealand religious tradition.³ The predominating religious culture of New Zealanders has been a distinctive colonial evangelicalism. The early settlers came into contact with a new environment which had a severely reductionist effect on the more comprehensive evangelical tradition with which they were familiar. Removed from the advantages of the European urban environment the settlers came to emphasise a limited number of moral virtues such as diligence, frugality and self-restraint which were prized for their pragmatic value. The New Zealand settlers stripped down the original interests and demands of their parent tradition to meet the new colonial circumstances. This colonial evangelicalism consisted of:

a few simple beliefs and rules by means of which some sense of direction or order is provided for an uncomplicated existence. The basic meaning of that existence, without mystery or hiddenness, is never in doubt, nor requires expression in rite, sacrament or ceremonial.⁴

Religious belief in this type of colonial evangelicalism was characterised by an attitude of obedience to the practical values of the protestant work ethic required by the New Zealand environment. Moreover, New Zealand colonial evangelicalism was a form of pietism embraced by christians of all denominations. Dr O'Reilly points out that in New Zealand literature even roman catholics are depicted as having this simplified evangelical faith despite the considerable emphasis on sacrament and ritual in

3 The interpretation of the New Zealand religious tradition advanced here is taken from an article in preparation by Dr K. O'Reilly, "Fiction and Indigenous Roman Catholicism."

4 O'Reilly "Fiction and Indigenous Roman Catholicism", p.6.

their tradition. However colonial evangelicalism was particularly vulnerable to scepticism as New Zealand ceased to be a simple agrarian, colonial society. From the end of the nineteenth century on, the New Zealand social order grew in complexity and was subject to increasing change, culminating in the major social upheaval of the first world war. Throughout this period people fell away from the churches as they perceived an incompatibility between their experience of life and the accepted ways of comprehending it. The changing social order steadily weakened a colonial evangelicalism whose goals and values ceased to be socially reinforced. The emergence of anglo catholicism in Christchurch coincides with the weakening of this New Zealand religious tradition. Scepticism and agnosticism stemmed from the same circumstances.

Turning from the general to the particular it is possible to see how the origins of the movement determined its future character in Christchurch. Christchurch anglo catholicism has been based on St. Michael's which has become an eclectic parish drawing its congregation from all over the city. This has been a source of strength to the movement since the continuity of the catholic tradition in the parish has meant that this type of worship has always been accessible to those who desire it. St. Luke's has also fulfilled this function, though to a lesser extent. It is clear that anglo catholicism has remained strongly congregationalist and that the greater part of the anglican church has remained relatively untouched by it.

However, the movement has had a considerable impact on the New Zealand anglican church through the general and widespread diffusion of liturgical principles and practice. Most clergy now wear the surplice and coloured stoles, adopt the eastward position and use

the mixed chalice. Many churches have sung eucharists, coloured altar frontals, burses and veils for the communion vessels. What Carlyon unsuccessfully attempted to achieve by direct methods, even to the point of confrontation, time and secondary influences have made commonplace and unremarkable. The seminal period of the movement, which was also an era of something approaching persecution, has left as one of its legacies an attitude at once aggressive and defensive amongst succeeding generations of New Zealand anglo catholics. As with anglo catholicism the world over, a mythology of martyrdom has left its adherents ever ready to take up the cudgels against all manner of real or imagined foes, particularly bishops. Just as the movement was never a purely clerical one in the early days of Canterbury, so it has always retained a strong measure of lay support. The real significance of St. Michael's is that its congregation is largely made up of lay people who understand and support the movement. Wherever the movement has been purely clerical in origin, and has made only a skin deep impression on the laity, it has always languished.

All these features have parallels with the English scene. There were, however, some differences. Liberal catholicism did not have the same influence that it had in England. Some of the clergy were influenced by it, though in the case of Averill and Julius it did little to change their churchmanship. Some of Gore's books were included in the syllabus for theological students. But the lux mundi school was generally ignored by New Zealand clergy which is, perhaps, not surprising since few of them had faced the implications of critical biblical research in contemporary liberal protestant theology. Money's career at Avonside shows that there was a similar lack of interest in christian socialism before the first world war. It was only in the 1920's

that the New Zealand church began to interest itself in the social gospel. The greatest difference, perhaps, is that anglo catholicism was never to enjoy the power and influence that it gained in England. New Zealand anglo catholicism did not produce the stream of bishops, higher ecclesiastics, and eminent theologians who did so much to enrich the life of the English church.

Christchurch anglo catholicism became a kind of sub culture within the larger anglican parent body. Its influence on worship has been considerable, on theological ideas rather less. To have succeeded in establishing itself at all has been a considerable achievement in the particular circumstances of Canterbury society.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to express my appreciation to the following who helped in special ways to make this thesis possible. The assistance of the following librarians and libraries is gratefully acknowledged: J. C. Wilson and the Canterbury Museum Library; R. C. Lamb and the Canterbury Public Library; the staffs of the Canterbury University Library, the Alexander Turnbull Library and the National Archives. The following have helped in the preparation of this thesis, either by locating sources, or in making material available, or by way of discussion and criticism: S. R. Cuming; the Reverend M. F. Ardley; the Reverend C. G. Brown; the Reverend M. W. Blain; Archdeacon R. J. P. Witty; A. G. Hendery and B. J. Lewis. The following have given special assistance with the final drafts and typescript: Miss M. S. Holloway; my father and mother.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. MANUSCRIPT SOURCES, OFFICIAL

Carlyon Papers	CDA
Harper, George, biographical notes	CML
Kaiapoi Vestry Minutes	KPO
St. Michael's Vestry Minutes, 1904-12	SMPO
St. Michael's Vestry Book, 1905-13	SMPO
Standing Committee Minute Books, 1876-84	CDA
Two Books Regarding Charges Against Clergy	CDA

B. PRINTED SOURCES, OFFICIAL

Canterbury Papers. Information concerning the Principles, Objects, Plans and Proceedings of the Founders of the Settlement of Canterbury ... London, 1850	CML
Perry-Gosset: copy of a Declaration by C. H. Gosset in the matter of a charge preferred against C. E. Perry, 3 May 1918	
Perry-Gosset Papers	NAW

C. MANUSCRIPT SOURCES, UNOFFICIAL

Canterbury Papers: letters to and from J. R. Godley, letters from E. G. Wakefield, letters to J. E. Fitzgerald	(transcripts) ATL
Cobham Papers	CML
Diary of H. J. C. Gilbert, 1897	PS
Hall Newspaper Extracts	CUL
Letter from Fred Livingstone, 23 Apr 1913	AP

O'Reilly, K., ⁷ Fiction and Indig- enous Roman Catholicism". An article in preparation for pub- lication in New Zealand.	PS
Perry-Gosset Trial Notes by Rev. C. E. Perry	SMPO
Selfe Papers (xerox copies)	CML
Henry Sewell's Journal (typescript)	CUL

D. NEWSPAPERS AND PERIODICALS

<u>Australia and New Zealand Gazette</u> , 1850-2	CUL
<u>Church Chronicle</u> , Wellington	WDA
<u>Church Gazette</u> , Auckland	ADA
<u>Church Magazine</u> , Christchurch	KPO
<u>Lyttelton Times</u> , Lyttelton, ? 1851-1935	CPL
<u>St. Michael's Herald</u> , Christchurch	SMPO
<u>N. Z. Church News</u> , Christchurch	CDA
<u>New Zealand Journal</u> , 1840-52	CUL
<u>Press</u> , Christchurch, 1861 -	CPL
<u>Sun</u> , Christchurch, 1914-35	CPL

E. INTERVIEWS

Cuming, S. R., St. Michael's parish-
ioner and parish historian.

Evans, J. H., church historian, bishop's
chaplain, diocese of Nelson.

Gilbert, C., daughter of the Reverend H.
J. C. Gilbert.

Harrison, C., director of religious broad-
casting, NZBC.

Hendry, J. A., Christchurch ecclesiastical
architect

Miller, Harold, former librarian, Victoria
University Library.

Palmer, H., former parishioner of Phillips-
town.

Pascoe, P., Christchurch architect.
 Schollar, K., retired priest.
 Sutton, P., Bishop of Nelson.
 Witty, R.J.P., Archdeacon of Christchurch.

F. CORRESPONDENCE

Arnold, Canon W.C., former vicar of Phillipstown
 and Kaiapoi, 8 Apr 1975.
 Breward, I., Professor church history, Knox theo-
 logical College, 27 Jan 1975.
 Constance, Sister, Community of the Sacred Name,
 Christchurch, 16 Jul 1975.
 Hilliard, D.L., senior lecturer in history at
 Flinders University, Adelaide, South Australia,
 23 Jun 1975.
 Lochhead, I., art history student engaged on a thesis
 on B. J. Mountfort, 2 Oct, 1975.
 Morrell, W.P., Dunedin historian, 5 Jan 1975.
 Simmons, A., vicar of St. Benedict's, Aldershot West,
 England, former parishioner of Canon Burton, 29
 Jun 1975.
 Taylor, R.P., former vicar of Kaiapoi, 29 Apr 1975.

G. BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS

Adderley, C.B., Extracts from Letters of J. R.
 Godley to C. B. Adderley, London, 1865.
 Allchin, A.M., The Silent Rebellion, London, 1958.
 Blake, R., Disraeli, London, 1969.
 Brathwaite, E., The House Built Upon A Rock:
 A Centennial History of the Church of St. Mary,
 Merivale, Christchurch 1866-1966,
 Christchurch, 1966.
 Carrington, C.E., John Robert Godley of Canterbury,
 Christchurch, 1950.
 Chadwick, O., The Mind of the Oxford Movement,
 London, 1960.
 Chadwick, O., The Victorian Church, Part 1,
 London, 1970.
 The Victorian Church, part 11,
 London 1970.

- Charles, L. A., A Brief History of the Parish of St. Stephen, Ashburton, Ashburton, 1951.
- Church, R. W., The Oxford Movement 1833-1845, London, 1892.
- Clark, K., The Gothic Revival, U.S.A, 1974.
- Crockford's Clerical Directory, London, 1878 and 1899 editions.
- Cuming, S. R., Church of St. Michael And All Angels, 1872-1972, Christchurch, 1972.
- Davies, H., Worship and Theology in England 1600-1850, London, 1961.
- Worship and Theology in England 1850-1900, London, 1962.
- Worship and Theology in England 1900-1965, London, 1965.
- Dedication of Community House, 28 Feb. 1895 DCSB pamphlet, CSN archives, Christchurch, 1895.
- The Deaconess Community of the Sisters of Bethany, DCSB publication, Christchurch, 1910.
- Dickson, J., Shall Ritualism and Romanism Capture N.Z., Dunedin, 1912.
- Elworthy, G.F.L. and Elworthy, A.C., A Power in the Land, Christchurch, 1971.
- Evans, J.H., Churchman Militant, London, 1964.
- Every, G., The High Church Party 1688-1718, London, 1956.
- Fraer, C.A., A Short History of the Church of the Good Shepherd Christchurch, N.Z., Christchurch, (date unknown).
- Garnett, R., Edward Gibbon Wakefield, London, 1897.
- Gillies, W., High Churchianity, a Superstition Not New Testament Christianity, Timaru, 1893.
- Godley, C., Letters from Early New Zealand, Christchurch, 1951.
- Gwynn, D., Lord Shrewsbury, Pugin and the Catholic Revival, London, 1946.
- Harper, H. J.C., A Letter to the Editor of the N.Z. Church News on an article entitled "No Popery Cry" with a postscript in answer to the enquiries of the Archdeacon of Timaru, Christchurch, 1876.

- Hill, Michael, The Religious Order, London, 1973.
- A History of Canterbury
 Vol. 1, to 1854, James Hight and C. R. Straubel (eds), Christchurch, 1957
 Vol. 2, 1854-76 and Cultural Aspects, W.J. Gardner (ed), Christchurch, 1971.
 Vol. 3., 1876-1950, by W. H. Scotter, Christchurch, 1965.
- Hocken, T.M. (ed), A Bibliography of the Literature Relating to New Zealand, Wellington, 1909.
- Johnstone, A. H. (ed), Canterbury Books 1847-1955: A Bibliography, Christchurch, 1956.
- Johnstone, A. H. (compiler), Supplement to Hocken's Bibliography of N. Z. Literature, Christchurch, 1927.
- Kirk, R., A Crisis in the Church, or the Church of Christ Versus Ritualistic Sacerdotalism, Auckland, 1899.
- Lee, S., Dictionary of National Biography, London, 1909.
- Livingstone, J.C., Modern Christian Thought, from the enlightenment to Vatican II, New York, 1971.
- Lloyd, R., The Church of England, 1900-1965, London, 1966.
- Miller, John, Early Victorian New Zealand, London, 1958.
- Monaghan, H.W., From Age to Age, Wellington, 1957.
- Parr, S., Canterbury Pilgrimage, Christchurch, 1951.
- Purchas, H.T., Bishop Harper and the Canterbury Settlement, Christchurch, 1909.
- Purches, H.T., A History of the English Church in New Zealand, Christchurch, 1914.
- Scotter, W.H., The Church of St. Mary the Virgin Addington 1867-1967, Christchurch, 1967.
- A Short History of the Community of The Sacred Name, (Written and published by CSN), 1975.
- Thompson, C., The History of St. Michael and All Angels, Christchurch, 1971.
- Tucker, H. W., Memoirs of the Life and Episcopate of George Augustus Selwyn, D.D., Vols 1 and 2, London, 1879.
- Vidler, Alec, The Church in an Age of Revolution, London, 1971.
- Voll, Dieter, Catholic Evangelicalism, London, 1963.

- Wakefield, E.J., The Founders of Canterbury, London, 1973.
- Walsh, W., The Secret History of the Oxford Movement, London, 1899.
- Williams, N.P. and Harris, C. (eds), Northern Catholicism, London, 1933.
- Williams, W.T., A Short History of the Parish of Avonside Christchurch New Zealand, 1855-1955, Christchurch, 1955.

H. UNPUBLISHED THESES

- Unless otherwise indicated, these are theses presented for the degree of M.A. in the University of Canterbury.
- Cocks, P.S., "Early Canterbury in the Light of Henry Sewell's Journal ...", 1948.
- Cooper, A.P., "The Oxford Movement in Australia", Ph.D, Monash University, 1973.
- Glen, R.M., "The Canterbury Association --- 1848-56", 1952.
- Greenaway, R.L.N., "Henry Selfe Selfe and the Origins and Early Development of Canterbury", 1972.
- Marr, M.J., "An estimate of the Influences behind the Settlement of Canterbury ...", 1947.
- Pocock, P., "John Robert Godley", 1949.
- Rathgen, D.G.S., "The Church in New Zealand 1890-1920", Diploma L.Th (Hons), St. John's College, Auckland, 1969.
- Spence, J.R., "The Church of England in Canterbury ...", 1948.
- Walden, H.R., "A study of Church Architecture with Special Emphasis on the Development of Anglican Church Architecture in Canterbury, New Zealand", B. Arch, Auckland University, 1961.

Tractarian Allies In The Canterbury Association

Sir J. T. Coleridge and J. D. Coleridge - Both were known to be tractarians. Sir J. T. Coleridge co-signed a memorial to the Vice Chancellor of Oxford in 1843 protesting against the suspension of Dr Pusey from preaching within the university for two years because of a sermon on eucharistic doctrine. "He was a member of the court before which the mandamus to the Archbishop of Canterbury to proceed with the confirmation of Dr Hampden as bishop of Hereford was applied for 14 Dec. 1848, and his known tractarian views raised the hopes of that party". D N B, Vol 1V, p. 758

Sir W. Heathcote, Bart. - He was Keble's squire.

R. Cavendish, M.P. - A member of the Management Committee and co-signatory of the famous resolutions of 19 March 1850, the most ominous protest against the Gorham judgement. Its 13 signatories were amongst the most distinguished figures in the tractarian movement.

The Earl of Lincoln and the Right Honourable Sydney Herbert M.P. - Analysing the angry reaction of the Peelites to Lord John Russell's famous open letter during the 1850 "No Popery" scare over the Papal aggression, Blake, Disraeli, "they contained among their number persons who would qualify, anyway to the low-church party, as Puseyites". Gladstone, Lincoln and Herbert". Lincoln served on the Management Committee in 1851.

The Dean of Canterbury (W. R. Lyall) - A Cambridge theologian of the old fashioned high churchmanship school.

Lord Lyttelton, - Distinguished member of the Management Committee. Although a moderate churchman he had been a member of the committee of influential laymen who founded the first anglican sisterhood at Park Village West in 1845.

J. C. Talbot, M.P. - A co-signatory of the resolutions of 19 March 1850.

W. Vaux - Member of the camden society. The D N B says of him, "He was connected with the early development of the Oxford movement in London, and his rooms were a frequent place of meeting for the sub-committees connected with the London Church Union and the foreign chaplaincies".

The Reverend R. C. Trench - Professor of Divinity at Kings College, London and afterwards Archbishop of Dublin, he attended the first conference of the tract writers at Hadleigh in 1833, identified himself with the tractarians - and was influenced by F. D. Maurice. He was a tractarian with wide sympathies to liberal divinity.

The Reverend N. Wade - Wakefield described him as being "not quite free from party reputation", which meant a high church reputation. Also a member of the Management Committee.